

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, the 20th October 1927.

The House met at 11 o'clock, the President (the hon. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU Garu) in the Chair.

PRESENT:

Marjoribanks, C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S., The hon. Mr. N. E.	Kuppuswami, Mr. J.
Usman Sahib Bahadur, The hon. Khan Bahadur Muhammad.	Madhavan Nayar, Mr. K.
Campbell, C.S.I., C.I.E., C.B.E., I.C.S., The hon. Mr. A. Y. G.	Mahmud Schammad Sahib Bahadur.
Maomichael, C.S.I., I.C.S., The hon. Mr. N. Subbarayan, The hon. Dr. P.	Mallayya, Dr. B. S.
Ranganatha Mudaliyar, The hon. Mr. A.	Manikkavelu Nayakar, Mr. M. A.
Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N.	Meera Ravuttar Bahadur, K. P. V. S. Muhammad
Abdul Hye Sahib Bahadur, K.	Muniswami Nayudu, Rao Bahadur B.
Abdul Razaq Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur S. K.	Muniswami Pillai, Mr. V. L.
Abdul Wahab Sahib Bahadur, Munshi.	Muppil Nayar of Kavalappara, Mr.
Adinarayana Chettiyar, Mr. T.	Murugappa Chettiyar, Diwan Bahadur A. M. M.
Anjaneyulu, Mr. P.	Muttayya Mudaliyar, Mr. S.
Appavu Chettiyar, Mr. C. D.	Muthulakshmi Reddi, Dr. (Mrs.).
Ari Gowder, Mr. H. B.	Muthuranga Mudaliyar, Mr. C. N.
Arpudaswami Udayar, Mr. S.	Nagan Gowda, Mr. R.
Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.	Nanjappa Bahadur, M.V.O., Subadar-Major S. A.
Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu, Mr. P.	Narayana Raja, Mr. D.
Bhanoji Rao, Mr. A. V.	Narayana Rao, Mr. M.
Bheemayya, Mr. J.	Narayanawami Pillai, Mr. T. M.
Biswanath Das Mahasayo, Sriman.	Obi Reddi, Mr. C.
Boag, I.C.S., Mr. G. T.	Tampoe, I.C.S., Mr. A. M. C.
Chambeis, Mr. G.	Parasurama Rao Pantulu, Mr. A.
Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar, Mr. T. K.	Parthasarathi Ayyangar, Mr. C. R.
Congreve, Mr. C. R. T.	Patro, Kt., Rao Bahadur Sir A. P.
Cotterell, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. C. B.	Premayya, Mr. G. R.
Davis, Mr. J. A.	Raja of Panagal, K.C.I.E. (Sir P. Ramarayanagar).
Dorai Raja, Mr. S. N.	Rajan, Mr. P. T.
Ethirajulu Nayudu, Diwan Bahadur P. C.	Ramachandra Padayachi, Mr. K.
Evans, C.S.I., I.C.S., Mr. F. B.	Ramachandra Reddi, Mr. B.
Foulkes, Mr. R.	Ramalinga Reddi, Mr. G.
Gangadhara Siva, Mr. M. V.	Ramanath Goenka, Mr.
Gnanavaram Pillai, Mr. P. J.	Ramasomayajulu, Mr. C.
Gopala Menon, Mr. C.	Ramjee Rao, Mr. V.
Govindaraja Mudaliyar, Mr. C. S.	Ramaswami Ayyar, Mr. U.
Guruswami, Rao Sahib L. C.	Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar, Rao Bahadur C. S.
Hall, C.B.E., I.C.S., Mr. J. F.	Sahajanandam, Swami A. S.
Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur, Abdul.	Saldanha, Mr. J. A.
Hampayya, Rai Sahib M.	Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, Mr.
Harisarvottama Rao, Mr. G.	Sarabha Reddi, Mr. K.
Hearson, Mr. H. F. P.	Satyamurti, Mr. S.
John, Mr. V. Ch.	Seturatnam Ayyar, Mr. M. R.
Kaleswara Rao, Mr. A.	Shetty, Mr. A. B.
Karant, Mr. K. R.	Sitarama Reddi, Rao Bahadur K.
Koti Reddi, Mr. K.	Siva Raj, Mr. N.
Krishnan, Mr. K.	Siva Rao, Mr. P.
Krishnan Nayar, Diwan Bahadur M.	Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar, Mr. K. S.
Krishnaswami Nayakar, Mr. K. V.	Slater, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. S. H.
Kumaraswami Reddiyar, Diwan Bahadur S.	Smith, Mr. J. Mackenzie.
	Srinivasa Ayyangar, Mr. R.
	Srinivasa Ayyangar, Mr. T. C.

[20th October 1927]

PRESENT—cont.

Srinivasan, Rao Sahib R.
 Satham, Mr. R. M.
 Subrahmanya Mocpanar, Mr. S.
 Subrahmanya Pillai, Mr. Chavadi K.
 Swami, Mr. K. V. R.
 Syed Ibrahim Sahib Bahadur, Nattam Dubash
 Kadir Sahib.
 Tajudin Sahib Bahadur, Syed.
 Thomas, Mr. Daniel.
 Tulsiram, Mr. L. K.
 Uppi Sahib Bahadur, K.
 Vanavudsiya Goundar, Mr. S. V.

Venkatapathi Raju, Mr. P. C.
 Venkatarama Ayyar, Mr. K. R.
 Venkatarama Sastri, c.i.e., Mr. T. R.
 Venkataramana Ayyangar, Mr. C. V.
 Venkatarangam Nayudu, Mr. C.
 Venkiah, Mr. S.
 Wood, Mr. C. E.
 Zamindar of Gollapalli.
 Zamindar of Kallikota.
 Zamindar of Mirzaporam.
 Zamindar of Seithor.

I

NEW MEMBER.

The following new Member was sworn in :—

Mr. R. M. STATHAM.

II

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

[Order made by the President of the Madras Legislative Council under Standing Order No. 15.]

1. Starred questions to be put at a meeting of the Council with their answers shall be printed and placed on the Council table an hour before the President takes his seat.

The President will call out the name of each interpellator in the order in which the names are printed, specify the serial number of his question and make a sufficient pause to give him or any other member a reasonable opportunity of rising in his place and putting a supplementary question. Supplementary questions must be put immediately after the principal questions to which they relate.

2. If a member responsible for a starred question happens to be absent when it is called, it will be open either to him or to any other member to put supplementary questions thereon after the other starred questions for the day have been answered, provided question-time is not thereby exceeded.

3. Questions, not starred, will not be called in Council, but they will be printed with their answers and placed on the table of the House along with the list of starred questions. Oral supplementary questions will not be allowed in regard to unstarred questions.]

STARRED QUESTIONS

(708 Q.—Please see page 256 infra.)

Irrigation (Water-rate)

Exclusion of certain lands from the Kistna Eastern Delta ayacut.

*709 Q.—MR. A. KALESWARA RAO: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state with reference to the answer to question No. 506 answered on 24th March 1927—

(a) whether the report called for has come; when and from whom;

(b) if so, whether the Government will place it on the table of this House; what are its contents;

(c) whether the Government intend to include all those lands in the ayacut; and

(d) whether the Government will credit the penal assessments collected on them till now under the inclusion fees due and collect only the balance?

20th October 1927]

A.—(a) & (b) A report on the subject was received from the Board of Revenue on 21st June 1927. It dealt only with the question of the continued prohibition against inclusion of certain lands in the wet ayacut. It will not be placed on the table.

(c) The prohibition against including the lands in the ayacut has been withdrawn.

(d) The Government have not yet received any information as to the levy of penal assessments. The suggestion in the question will now be considered.

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO:—"With reference to the answer to clause (d), may I ask whether the Government will get the information how much penal assessment has been collected on the lands of the non-co-operators hitherto?"

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS:—"We have stated in clause (a) that the suggestion that the penal assessment should be credited under the inclusion fee would be considered. Of course, we will have to ascertain the amount, in doing so."

Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU:—"Now that the prohibition against inclusion is removed, may I know if the Government will issue a notification giving time for the ryots to pay the necessary inclusion fee and get the lands included in the ayacut? The time originally fixed has already expired."

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS:—"Certainly, we do not wish to preclude the matter on that ground."

Exclusion of Pedalanka lands from the Kistna Eastern delta ayacut.

* 710 Q.—Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue and the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government have ordered the exclusion of Pedalanka lands, about 300 acres in extent, in Kaikalur taluk from the ayacut of Kistna Eastern delta and whether the owners of these lands protested against the exclusion;

(b) whether the lands proposed to be given in exchange for Pedalanka lands are situated in Gadivada taluk and are inconveniently situated for the ryots for cultivation purposes owing to great distances from their homes;

(c) whether the Government are aware that after the raising of shutters of the Kistna anicut the Pedalanka lands have been getting water copiously for irrigation and there are no complaints from the ryots regarding supply of water; and

(d) whether the Government propose to reconsider its decision in view of the circumstances now prevailing and cancel the order of exclusion of Pedalanka lands from the ayacut?

A.—(a) The localization of the irrigable ayacut of the Kistna Eastern delta involved the exclusion of about 3,654 acres of wet land from the ayacut. The reasons for the exclusion were the difficulties in supplying water to small isolated and remote patches of land, and the advantages, from the point of view of economy of water and facility of supply, of concentrating the

[20th October 1927]

irrigable area into compact blocks. One or other of the following arrangements was made with the ryots concerned in such cases—

- (1) The owners of the excluded wet lands transferred their wet rights to dry lands belonging to themselves or to others which dry lands were suitable for inclusion in the ayacut and were so included; or
- (2) The owners of the excluded wet lands were given an equal area of Government waste lands to be registered as wet in exchange for the wet lands excluded from the ayacut and taken over by the Government; or
- (3) The owners of the excluded wet lands in exchange for the wet rights of the lands excluded were granted Government waste land, registered as wet, to the extent of half the area of the land excluded. Out of 3,654 acres of wet land selected for exclusion, only in the case of 11.61 acres of wet land could no final settlement be made with their owners. Of these 11.61 acres, an extent of 1.51 acres was acquired by the Government and the remaining extent was left as it was.

The Government do not know whether the Pedalanka lands were among those excluded from the ayacut.

(b) The Government have no information.

(c) & (d) It has been decided to test the new shutters for three years before considering any extension of irrigation.

Exemption of lands in Kistna Eastern delta from inclusion fees.

* 711 Q.—Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received the report mentioned in the answer to my starred question No. 549, answered on 25th March 1927, regarding exemption of lands in Kistna Eastern delta from inclusion fees;

(b) what its contents are and whether the Government will place it on the table of this House; and

(c) what action the Government propose to take to free all those ryots from penal assessments?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) The Board's report has not yet been received.

(712 Q.—Please see page 257 infra.)

Emigration

Alleged defective arrangements in the ships carrying repatriates from South Africa.

* 713 Q.—Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state, with reference to question No. 68, answered on 26th January 1927, regarding the defective arrangements in the ships carrying repatriates from South Africa referred to in the report of the Commissioner of Labour for the year 1925-26—

(a) whether any berth arrangements have been made in the above ships;

20th October 1927]

(b) what the result of the correspondence between this Government and the Government of India regarding this subject is ; and

(c) whether the correspondence will be placed on the table ?

A.—(a) & (b) The hon. Member is referred to the answer already given to question No. 163.

(c) The Government of India's correspondence cannot be placed on the table.

Factories

Prosecutions and fines imposed on factory proprietors every year.

* 714 Q.—Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR : Will the hon the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government will be pleased to give the annual number of prosecutions and the total amount of fines imposed on factory proprietors every year, for the three years ending with 31st March 1927 ;

(b) whether the Government have received complaints that the factory inspectors are systematically teasing small rice-mill owners for trivial omissions such as failure to whitewash walls or to paint door frames, at very short intervals ;

(c) whether they are aware that many of these so-called factories are petty concerns serving a limited area and often working only during harvest-seasons of paddy or groundnuts ;

(d) whether Government will be pleased to investigate the matter and ascertain whether prosecutions under the Factories Act are ordered only for sufficient causes ; and

(e) whether Government have already issued or are contemplating to issue any instructions directing the factory inspectors not to charge small mill-owners for really trivial and petty omissions or lapses on their part ?

A.—(a) The hon. Member is referred to Appendix IV in the annual provincial factory reports for 1924 and 1926 and Appendix III in the report for 1925, which have been placed on the Editors' Table. The reports are for calendar years only.

(b) No.

(c) The Government are aware that there are a number of seasonal factories.

(d) & (e) The Government have no reason to think that prosecutions are launched for insufficient causes or on frivolous grounds.

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“ With reference to the answers to clauses (d) and (e), may I ask the hon. the Home Member whether prosecutions are launched for petty so-called offences as not painting door frames and not whitewashing the walls ? ”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—“ The Government are not aware of the fact. If the hon. Member will bring to my notice any specific instances, I will look into them.”

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“ Will the hon. the Home Member get the information whether there have been prosecutions for such petty offences ? ”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—“ Yes.”

[20th October 1927]

Forests

Reduction in the number of Conservators of Forests.

* 715 Q.—**MR. J. A. SALDANHA**: With reference to my question No. 165 answered on 26th August 1927 will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether owing to the change in the Forest Conservancy policy the number of Conservators is going to be reduced and, if so, by what gradual process?

A.—The matter is under the consideration of Government

(716 Q.—Please see page 258 infra)

The hon. the **PRESIDENT**:—"The hon. Member is not in his place"

(Mr. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed wanted to put a supplementary question.)

The hon. the **PRESIDENT**:—"The hon. Member is requested to read the instructions printed at the first page of the list of questions and answers."

Civil Justice

Holding of the posts of Sarishtadar and head clerk by the members of the same community.

* 717 Q.—**MR. R. NAGAN GOWDA**: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether except in the districts of Anantapur, Cuddapah, Godavari, Madura, Malabar (North and South), Tanjore (East and West), Tinnevely and Trichinopoly, the two ministerial posts, Sarishtadar and head clerk of the District Court are held by members of the same community; and

(b) if not, in how many and what districts of the Presidency the ministerial posts are held by members of the same community in contravention of the principle accepted in the Standing Order No. 128 of the Board of Revenue?

A.—(a) & (b) On 31st March 1927 the two ministerial posts of sarishtadar and head clerk of district courts were held by members of different communities in Anantapur, Chingleput, Cuddapah, Godavari East, Guntur, North and South Malabar, Tanjore West, Tinnevely, Trichinopoly and Vizagapatam districts. The Board's Standing Order No. 128 is not applicable to the Judicial Department.

MR. R. NAGAN GOWDA:—"May I know why the principle that the Sarishtadars and head clerks should not be members of the same community is not applicable to the Judicial Department?"

The hon. **MR. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL**:—"The Board's Standing Orders apply only to the Revenue Department."

Claims of Moslems for the post of acting High Court Judges.

* 718 Q.—**MR. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI**: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state why the Government have ignored the claims of Moslems with reference to the appointment of acting High Court Judges in spite of the repeated assurances that were given in the Legislative Council by the member in charge that at the next vacancy such claims would be duly considered?

20th October 1927]

A.—The Government did not ignore the claims of Muhammadans but considered them carefully.

Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI :—" May I know the names of Moslem members who were considered ? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" I am not prepared to give the names."

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN SAHIB :—" May I know from the hon. Member whether, after considering the matter carefully, the Government is of the opinion that there are not competent Moslems to take the place of a High Court Judge in Madras ? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" I am not prepared to answer that question."

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN SAHIB :—" May I know from the hon. the Law Member whether the Government has tried to find a Moslem either in this Presidency or elsewhere ? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" I am not able to add anything to the answer already given."

Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR :—" The hon. Member need not give the names. May I ask how many names were considered ? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" No, Sir I cannot give the information."

Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI :—" May I know whether the names of any Moslem gentlemen from other provinces have been considered ? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" I am not prepared to answer any question of that sort."

Appointment of District and Sessions Judges.

* 719 Q.—Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the names of Messrs. Abbas Ali Khan and N. Chandrasekhara Ayyar were before the Government for appointment as District Judges in June 1926 ; whether the appointments were not made on the ground that it was not advisable to appoint practising lawyers for temporary periods to such posts ;

(b) whether it is a fact that the then Law Member had written a series of letters to one of these two candidates to prepare himself for the appointment of a District Judgeship and that he would get the post by September 22nd ;

(c) whether it is a fact that the Moslem gentleman was practically assured by the Government of such appointment and that it was only on technical grounds that the appointment was not made at that time ;

(d) why the claims of the Moslem gentleman have now been overlooked and how a non-Moslem gentleman has been appointed to the post of City Civil Court Judge ; and

[20th October 1927]

(e) whether the Government will be pleased to state the number of gentlemen castewar now occupying the post of District and Sessions Judges and additional District and Sessions Judges in the Presidency either permanently or temporarily?

A.—(a) The answer to the first part of the clause is in the negative; the second part does not arise.

(b) The Government have no information.

(c) No.

(d) The Government do not admit that his 'claims' have been overlooked.

(e) The figures as they stood on 1st September 1927 are given below:—

Brahmans	...	...	...	...	13
Non-Brahman Hindus	...	...	...	...	3
Muhammadans	...	...	...	...	2
Non-Asiatics and Anglo-Indians	...	...	...	...	9
Indian Christians	...	...	...	...	1

MR. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI:—"May I know with reference to clause (b), whether any individual Member of the Government knows that information?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"I do not know, Sir."

Valuation of small-cause suits in the original and appellate sides.

* 720 Q.—MR. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether in suits of a small-cause nature, tried by District Munsifs on the original side, from whose decisions appeals are entertained in district courts, court-fee at $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent is collected in the court of first instance, and at $11\frac{1}{4}$ per cent in the appellate court, in all the district courts in the Presidency;

(b) if not, in which courts it is so levied; and

(c) whether the Government propose to remove the anomaly by amending the Court Fees Act, so that even in appeals in such suits, a court-fee of only $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent is collected?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) The matter is under consideration.

MR. A. B. SHETTY:—"May I know how long it has been under consideration and when a decision is likely to be reached?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"I must ask for notice for the first part of the question. I cannot answer the second part."

MR. A. B. SHETTY:—"How long it has been under consideration?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"I must ask for notice of the question."

20th October 1927]

Legislation to reduce the scale of court-fees.

* 721 Q.—Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether and when he will introduce legislation so as to reduce the scale of court fees; and

(b) under what heads the Government will propose reduction and to what extent?

A.—(a) & (b) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to clause (b) of question No. 386.

Legislative

Alleged issue of a whip for the no-confidence motion.

* 722 Q.—Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Law Member and the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state whether any whip has been issued by any Member of the Government or by any permanent official of the Government to any Member or to any section of the Council to attend the meeting of the Legislative Council and to support the Ministry in the no-confidence motion?

A.—No such action has been taken by or by the authority of the Governor in Council.

Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know whether any Member of the Government issued a whip in his personal capacity, though not with the authority of the Governor in Council?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"I cannot tell, Sir."

Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask whether the hon. Member is not personally aware whether any individual Member of the Government has issued a whip in his personal capacity?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"I am not personally aware of it."

Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"As Law Member, is he aware?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"I am not aware of it"

Police

Communal representation in the Police department.

* 723 Q.—MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Law Member and hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the number of Deputy Superintendents, Inspectors, Sub-Inspectors and constables in the Police department in the districts of South Kanara and Malabar, respectively, classed according to denominations, as Hindu, Muhammadan, Christian or the Depressed classes;

(b) what the Government propose to do to remedy the preponderance of certain communities over the others;

(c) whether it is the policy of this Government to see that there is no excessive representation of particular communities in the services at the expense of others;

[20th October 1927]

(d) whether the Government will be pleased to state how many Mappilla Deputy Superintendents of Police there are in the whole Presidency; and

(e) whether the Government will be pleased to take early steps to appoint competent Mappillas as Deputy Superintendents of Police?

A.—(a)—

	Deputy Superintendents.		Inspectors.		Sub-Inspectors.		Constables.	
	Malabar.	South Kanara.	Malabar.	South Kanara.	Malabar.	South Kanara.	Malabar.	South Kanara.
			(on 1st April 1927)		(on 1st April 1927)			
Hindus	2	..	13	3	56	20	1,102	352
Muhammadians	..	..	..	1	6	1	143	33
Christians	..	..	1	2	2	8	10	78
Depressed classes	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Others	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..

(b) Government have already issued orders directing heads of departments to see that the claims of the various castes and communities are considered when making appointments and have also prescribed the submission of annual returns showing the number of officers of each community holding permanent and temporary appointments. The Government do not propose to take any further action at present.

(c) Yes.

(d) There are no Mappilla Deputy Superintendents of Police at present. There is one Mappilla Assistant Superintendent of Police.

(e) If competent and qualified Mappillas are available for appointment as Deputy Superintendents of Police, their claims will be considered along with those of similarly qualified members of other communities.

Cantonments

Separation of Alandur from the St. Thomas' Mount Cantonment area.

* 724 Q.—Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI: Will the hon. the Member for Finance and the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government of Madras obtained sanction from the Military authorities for the separation of Alandur from the St. Thomas' Mount Cantonment area;

(b) if such a sanction was obtained, when the Government of Madras intend to form Alandur into a union; and

(c) if such a sanction was not obtained, in what stage the proposal to separate Alandur from the St. Thomas' Mount Cantonment area is?

20th October 1927]

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The matter is one for the District Board.

(c) Does not arise.

Education

Government Order barring secondary trained teachers from becoming Deputy Inspectors of Schools.

* 725 Q.—MR. A. KALESWARA RAO: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Director of Public Instruction has submitted for the orders of Government the other cases mentioned in the answer to the starred question No. 633, answered on 29th March 1927, of Mr. Abdul Hye Sahib;

(b) how many such cases have been since submitted and what action has been taken by the Government; and

(c) whether the Government will make an investigation into the whole matter and exempt and reinstate all the persons who were acting as Deputy Inspectors till 19th April 1926, when the G.O. (Press) No. 656, Law (Education) was issued framing the Junior Deputy Inspectors scheme?

A.—(a) & (b) Recommendations were received on behalf of eleven persons and these were approved by the Government.

(c) Appointments to the Subordinate Educational Service are made by the Director of Public Instruction and it is always open to him to apply to the Government for special sanction to the employment of persons who do not possess the prescribed qualifications. The Government do not propose to institute any general enquiry in the manner suggested.

Memorial from the school assistants regarding the Knapp scheme of pay.

* 726 Q.—MR. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Knapp's scheme of pay for the Subordinate Educational Service at Rs. 100—5—150—10—250 was sanctioned, and if so, when and how long it was in force;

(b) whether pay was drawn according to the abovesaid scheme for a period of 14 months by the school assistants in the Subordinate Educational Service;

(c) why the said scale of pay was subsequently cut down to Rs. 75—5—100, 100—10—150, 150—10—250, with two bars: one at Rs. 100 and the other at Rs. 150; what led to the imposition of two such bars in the grade;

(d) whether it is a fact that school assistants have submitted memorials to the Governor and the Minister for the redress of their grievances; and

(e) whether the hon. the Minister will be pleased to state what action has been taken thereon and to place a copy of the orders, if any, on the table of the House?

[20th October 1927]

4.—The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answers to question No. 822 asked at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 31st March 1927 and to question No. 295 at the meeting held on 27th August 1927.

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—“ May I know whether the hon. the Minister is going to revise the pay of the school assistants ? ”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ That matter is under consideration.”

Conveyance facilities to Muhammadan Girls' schools.

727 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED : Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) what action has been taken on the memorial submitted to Government by the Muslims of Trichinopoly regarding the provision of conveyances for the Government Muhammadan Girls' Training School at Trichinopoly; and

(b) whether the Government have received any memorial from the Muhammadan Education Association of Southern India regarding the increase of the number of conveyances for the Government Hobart Training School for Muhammadan girls, and if so, what action has been taken thereon?

A.—(a) The request in the memorial was that conveyances might be provided at Government expense for the gosha students of the Government Training School for Muhammadan Women, Trichinopoly. The request was considered and negatived by Government.

(b) Yes. The question is under consideration.

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—“ May I know, Sir, any specific reasons for not considering the claims of the Trichinopoly Muhammadan Girls' Training School ? ”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ I cannot give any specific reasons ”

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—“ With reference to the answer to clause (b), may I know from the hon. the Minister in what state that consideration is, whether they have sanctioned the proposal, or whether they propose to do so or whether they have investigated the matter ? ”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ The matter is still under investigation.”

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—“ How long is it since the memorial was received ? ”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ I cannot say that exactly.”

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—“ May I know approximately how many months it is since the matter has come to his notice ? ”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ I cannot say that either.”

20th October 1927]

Alleged hardship to the mufassal applicants to the Hobart Muhammadan Training School, Madras.

* 728 Q.—MR. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that selection for admission into the Hobart Muhammadan Training School at Madras is conducted only at Madras, and that all applicants from all over the Presidency are required to go to Madras for the purpose;

(b) whether he is aware that great hardship is felt by poor Muslim girls in going to Madras from distant places for the selection, examination, etc., both on account of their poverty and their social conditions and habits;

(c) whether it is a fact that a large number of deserving girls do not get themselves selected owing to the present system of selection being held at Madras and on account of their financial and social position; and

(d) whether he proposes to take early steps to arrange for the holding of selection for admission into the Hobart Muhammadan Training School for Girls, in future, in district centres and remove the obstacles in the way of mufassal girls being selected in larger numbers?

A.—(a), (b), (c) & (d) The Government have no information. A report will be called for.

Hostel for Muslim girl students in the City of Madras.

* 729 Q.—MR. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any proposal for the construction of a hostel for Muslim girl students in the City of Madras by the Government; and

(b) if not, whether the Government will consider the necessity and desirability of constructing a suitable hostel for Muslim girls, both collegiate and non-collegiate, in the City of Madras with due regard for Muslim social customs and manners?

A.—(a) No.

(b) Yes.

MR. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED:—“May I know whether, if there is sufficient strength, the hon. the Minister will propose to have a hostel for Muslim girls in the city?”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—“I shall have that matter considered”.

(730 Q.—Please see page 259 infra).

Local Boards

Cancellations of the elections of the Presidents of the Tadepallegudem and Tanuku Taluk Boards.

* 731 Q.—RAO BAHADUR C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state why the elections of the Presidents of the Tadepallegudem and Tanuku Taluk Boards were set aside and whether it is due to the fact that there were not sufficient number of members to support the Swarajist candidates?

[20th October 1927]

A.—The Government cancelled the elections of the Presidents of the Tadepallegudem and Tanuku Taluk Boards said to have been held on 2nd June 1927 and 30th May 1927, respectively, after the postponement of the meetings summoned on these dates by the temporary presidents. The reason for the cancellation was that the elections held under such circumstances were in the opinion of the Government not valid.)

Nominations to the Bhimavaram, Ellore and Narsapur Taluk Boards.

* 732 Q.—Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state why three more members were nominated on the 28th June 1927 to the Bhimavaram Taluk Board, six more to the Ellore Taluk Board and four more to the Narsapur Taluk Board when the first nominations to these reconstituted boards were made on the 3rd May 1927?

A.—The hon. Member is referred to the answer given to clause (f) of question No. 301 on 27th August 1927.

Nominations to the Tanuku Taluk Board.

* 733 Q.—Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) why five more members were nominated to the Tadepallegudem Taluk Board on the 28th June and nine more to the Tanuku Taluk Board;

(b) by whom these names were recommended and how the gentlemen were found fit for nominations to these boards;

(c) whether it is a fact that elections to presidentships of these two boards were alleged to have taken place before these nominations were made; and

(d) whether it is with a view to facilitate the chances of particular candidates for the presidential election to be held again that these nominations were made?

A.—(a) The hon. Member is referred to the answer given to clause (f) of question No. 301 on 27th August 1927.

(b) The nominations were by the President, District Board, West Godavari. The Government have no information of the tests of fitness which he applied.

(c) Yes.

(d) No.

Enquiry into the alleged interest of some district board members in subsisting contracts of the board.

* 734 Q.—Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether an enquiry has been held with reference to the alleged interest of certain members of the Salem District Board in subsisting contracts of the board; and

(b) whether the Government will be pleased to lay on the table of the House the report of the Inspector of local bodies?

20th October 1927]

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The Government are not prepared to place the Inspector's report on the table of the House.

Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR :—" May I know, Sir, from the hon. the Minister for Local Self Government if similar complaints have been received from any other places. "

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" I cannot answer that question. "

Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR :—" With reference to the answer to clause (b), may I know whether the report is favourable to or against the President of the District Board ? "

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" The report is confidential and I am not prepared to give what is contained in the report. "

Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR :—" In view of the fact that the district board election was postponed by an order of the Government on account of this complaint,—if it is not confidential—will the hon. the Minister be pleased to say whether the report of the Inspector is favourable or unfavourable ? "

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" I have stated that I am not prepared to give an answer. "

Rao Bahadur K. SITARAMA REDDIYAR :—" Are the Government aware that there is a provision in the Local Boards Act itself that it is the concern of the local board primarily and not of the Government to question the matter in a court of law ? "

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" The Government are as well aware of that fact as the hon. Member. "

Policy of nominations to local bodies.

* 735 Q.—Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR : Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) why Rao Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu was renominated as a member of the District Board of Cuddapah and why Mr. V. T. Srinivasa Ayyangar was renominated as a member of the Municipal Council of Vellore ; and

(b) whether it is a fact that the Government propose to follow as a principle the nomination to local bodies of outgoing chairmen of municipal councils and presidents of local boards ?

A.—(a) M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu was reappointed as a member of the Cuddapah District Board chiefly in order that the Board might have the advantage of his experience.

No person of the name of V. T. Srinivasa Ayyangar was reappointed to the Vellore Municipal Council.

(b) The Government will consider each case on its merits.

(736 Q.—Please see page 262 infra.)

[20th October 1927]

Eligibility of depressed classes to vote at elections.

* 737 Q.—MR. S. VENKAYYA: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received representations urging them to abolish the system of nomination altogether and make every individual of the depressed classes above the age of 20 or 25 years eligible to vote irrespective of any property qualification; and

(b) whether the Government are contemplating this or any other method which would confer on the majority of the Adi-Andhras the right to vote at elections to local boards and municipal councils, and if so, to describe the same?

A.—(a) No.

(b) The Government have under consideration a proposal to replace nominations by elections; they have considered no proposal regarding electoral qualifications for Adi-Andhras.)

Municipal Councils*Nominations to the Vellore Municipal Council.*

11-15
a.m.

* 738 Q.—RAO BAHADUR C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state with reference to the nominations to the Vellore Municipal Council whether the five nominees were recommended by the district authorities for nomination?

A.—The Government are not prepared to furnish the information.

RAO BAHADUR C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know, Sir, whether the district authorities have been consulted in the matter?"

THE HON. DR. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"That is a matter between the Government and the district authorities."

RAO BAHADUR C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"Inasmuch as it is a Transferred subject, Sir, may I know from the hon. the Minister whether the district authorities were at least consulted in the matter, not to speak of their recommendation being given effect to or not?"

THE HON. DR. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"The district authorities were consulted."

MR. S. SATYAMURTI:—"May I know who the district authorities are?"

THE HON. DR. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"In regard to the municipal councils, it is generally the Collector of the district."

MR. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Exceptionally?"

THE HON. DR. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"There is no exception to the rule."

20th October 1927]

Village Panchayats

Alleged notice to close the Muhammadan burial ground at Karkul.

* 739 Q.—**MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur**: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received a petition from the Muhammadan residents of Karkul Kasha village protesting against the action of the Karkul Village Panchayat in giving notice to close the Muhammadan burial ground, S. No. 93-B/13;

(b) whether they have called for a report in the matter from the President of the Karkul Village Panchayat;

(c) whether it is a fact that the burial ground has been in existence for more than 300 years, and the few houses that are in the vicinity of the burial ground, came into existence long afterwards;

(d) whether it is a fact that there are generally only one or two cases of burial in the burial ground in question in the course of 2 or 3 years, the number of house owners privileged to bury their dead there, being very few; and

(e) whether the Government will be pleased to state what action they have taken in the matter so as to avoid much civil and criminal litigation?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) & (d) The Government have no information.

(e) The petition referred to in clause (a) was transferred to the Registrar-General of Panchayats for necessary action.

Co-operative Societies

Liquidation of Vellore Trade Union.

* 740 Q.—**MR. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR**: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Vellore Trading Union has recently been recommended for liquidation;

(b) whether it is a fact that by the liquidation of this society Mr. Murugesu Mudaliyar would lose his seat on the local Co-operative Union and consequently also on the Vellore District Bank as well as the Vellore District Council of Supervision;

(c) whether it is a fact that the late Deputy Registrar, Vellore, wanted to organize a "G. Ward" Co-operative Society while there has been another credit society catering for the people of this G. Ward;

(d) whether the organization of the G. Ward Society was solely with a view to enable Mr. Murugesu Mudaliyar to retain his seats on the Co-operative Union, the District Bank and the District Council;

(e) whether it is a fact that the late Deputy Registrar, failing to succeed in organizing the G. Ward Society, desired to organize a society at Sembakkam with special provision to admit residents of Kosapet (Vellore municipality) as members and whether this move was also with the special object of providing for Mr. Murugesu Mudaliyar;

[20th October 1927]

(f) whether it is a fact that the late Deputy Registrar, not succeeding in this attempt, organized a loan and sale society at Vellore, started it on work on 13th July last, after receiving orders for his transfer, and whether he gave membership to Mr. Murugesu Mudaliyar in this hastily organized and urgently started loan and sale society;

(g) whether the late Deputy Registrar has thereby started another non-credit society at a place where it had failed miserably and under the very person under whom it failed and had to be liquidated only just then; and

(h) whether it is a fact that with the knowledge of the late Deputy Registrar a person who has been recently proceeded against by himself for misappropriation has been elected to the directorship of this hastily started loan and sale society?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) Presumably Mr. Murugesu Mudaliyar would lose his seat on the local Co-operative Union and on the District Council of Supervision and also on the Board of Management of the District Bank.

(c) to (h) The Government have no information.

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“ May I ask the hon. the Development Minister how it is that in spite of the lapse of two months on a simple matter like this, the Government have no information ? ”

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ Most of these questions relate to what was probably in the minds of certain people.”

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“ Apart from what was in the minds of anybody, Sir, may I ask the hon. the Minister why the Deputy Registrar took these various steps mentioned in clauses (c) to (h), and how can such a calculated plan escape the knowledge of Government ? ”

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ In the cause of his duty, I believe.”

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“ But has he ascertained, Sir, whether all those devious steps were taken by the Deputy Registrar with a view to somehow see that Mr. Murugesu Mudaliyar did not lose his seat on the Board of Management of the District Bank ? ”

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ I am not aware of that, Sir.”

Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR :—“ May I know, Sir, whether to the local Co-operative Union and to the Board of Management of the District Bank, members can come by direct election ? ”

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ Notice, Sir.”

Industries

Management of the Carnatic Paper Mill, Limited, Rajahmundry.

* 741 Q.—Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI : Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(a) when the Carnatic Paper Mill, Limited, at Rajahmundry stopped work ;

20th October 1927]

(c) for how long the question of lending further sums has been under the consideration of the Government ;

(c) whether the Government have come to any decision with regard to lending further sums ;

(d) if so, what that decision is ; and

(e) whether the Government have come to any decision with regard to the future management of the mill ?

A.—(a) The Carnatic Paper Mill Company, Limited, have not yet commenced work.

(b) Apart from an overdraft of Rs. 1,34,469 guaranteed to the Imperial Bank of India in August 1926, the Government have so far sanctioned as shown below loans aggregating Rs. 4,64,000 to the Company :—

Rs. 4,00,000 were sanctioned in March 1925.	
Rs. 30,000	January 1926.
Rs. 20,000	June 1926.
Rs. 9,000	March 1927.
Rs. 5,000	July 1927.

An application from the Company for another large sum of Rs. 3,50,000 which was received in November 1925 has not yet been sanctioned.

(c), (d) & (e) The question of further financial assistance to the Company and that of its future control and management are engaging the attention of Government.

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—“ With regard to the answer to clause (a), may I know from the hon. the Minister whether the work was not commenced for want of funds ? ”

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ Very probably, Sir ”

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—“ When the Government have already advanced more than Rs. 4½ lakhs to this mill as a loan, does the hon. the Minister think that it is the special duty of the Government to advance further sums to make the mill going ? ”

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ I do not think that the mill has commenced work and the question whether the work should be commenced and how it should be done is a matter for consideration.”

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—“ Is the hon. the Minister aware, Sir, that the people have sunk about 16 lakhs already in the mill ? ”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ That question does not arise from the answer given.”

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—“ Is the hon. Minister aware that there is no other course left open for the Company to follow in order to get any help from the people, except from the Government ? ”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ That is asking for an opinion.”

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—“ May I know from the hon. the Minister whether before they promised to give this amount, the Government ascertained the aggregate amount that would be necessary for making the industry work ? ”

[20th October 1927]

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"The loan was granted, Sir, on the application of the parties concerned, and as the result of it an arrangement was come to."

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—"I wish to know, Sir, the total approximate amount that was found necessary for this mill to work before the Government decided to give them any contribution?"

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I should like to have notice of that question, Sir."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—"Sir, considering the fact that a large sum of of money was sanctioned to the mill in 1925 March and that the Company has not yet commenced work, may I know if the Government have come to any decision or when the Government will be in a position to come to a decision on the question of affording further financial facilities to the Company, especially in view of the fact that the Government have received an application from the Board of Management and that a very important national concern may be set agoing, if possible, as early as possible?"

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I am at one with the hon. the Member for the University in his anxiety to see that the concern is going; but just now we are carrying on negotiations with one or two firms to ascertain whether they will take up the work, and the matter has not reached the stage when anything can be said definitely."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"May I know whether any portion of the Rs. 4 and odd lakhs has been utilized, Sir?"

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Notice, Sir."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"The answer to clause (b) of the question says: 'Apart from an overdraft of Rs. 1 lakh and odd guaranteed to the Imperial Bank of India, the Government have so far sanctioned loans as below.' I want to know whether the company has utilized any portion of the overdraft?"

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I cannot say, offhand whether they have utilized any portion of it or not."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"In view of the fact that a large expenditure is incurred from month to month on maintenance, may I know whether the negotiations will be expedited and, if so, when we may expect a final decision on the matter?"

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"There is no necessity for expedition, Sir."

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—"May I know how long this question has been under the consideration of the Government?"

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"The Government have not yet sanctioned the loan."

Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU :—"Besides these loans granted by the Government, may I know if the company is indebted to some others to the extent of a lakh and odd?"

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I am not aware of the exact amount, Sir."

20th October 1927]

Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU :—“ If that is so, may I request the hon. the Minister to make an enquiry as to the financial capacity of the concern and determine whether the company can be taken up by the Government themselves and worked ? ”

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ That is a matter for consideration, and negotiations for that purpose are going on.”

Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR :—“ The answer to clause (b) says that such sums were advanced to the company ever since 1925 and the answer to clause (a) says that the company has not yet commenced work. May I know, Sir, whether work was originally commenced and afterwards it was suspended or whether the company has not at all commenced work ? ”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ May I know if this sum of 4½ lakhs stated here was given with a view to cover up all the other loans as well as to meet the necessary expenses ? ”

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—“ May I know from the hon. the Minister whether the Government are thinking of ending this mill altogether ? ”

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ Not at present.”

Paper mills in India, the bamboo pulp of which is manufactured on modern lines.

* 742 Q.—Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(a) the number of paper mills in India whose bamboo pulp is manufactured on modern lines; and

(b) whether there are any such mills in this Presidency ?

A.—(a) One.

(b) None.

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—“ May I know, Sir, the name of the one company mentioned in answer to clause (a) ? ”

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ It is called the India Paper Mill Company.”

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—“ Is it under private management or under Government management ? ”

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ I am not able to say that, Sir.”

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—“ Is this mill working now, Sir ? ”

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ In one of the reports, I saw, it was said that it was working.”

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—“ Since there is no paper mill working now in this Presidency, will the hon. the Minister see that by advancing money to this company, at least one mill will be working ? ”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The question does not arise.”

[20th October 1927]

Enquiry into the working of the Madura Industrial Institute.

*743 Q.—MR. K. V. R. SWAMI: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(a) whether further enquiry will be made to ascertain why the Madura Industrial Institute workshop is working at a loss;

(b) if so, when such enquiry will commence; and

(c) whether the enquiry will extend to the high salaries paid to the staff?

A.—(a) to (c) No such inquiry is under contemplation at present.

MR. L. K. TULASIRAM:—“Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state whether, considering the admittedly deplorable condition in which the accounts of the Madura Industrial Institute are kept, the Government will be pleased to order a further enquiry? In the Government Order issued by the Government, they have admitted that the accounts of this Institute are in a deplorable state. Considering that point, will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to order an immediate enquiry to be instituted?”

THE HON. MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—“An enquiry was held only very recently, and I do not think that any necessity has arisen for another enquiry to be made so soon after.”

MR. K. V. R. SWAMI:—“May I know, Sir, what the result was of that enquiry which was held recently?”

THE HON. MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—“It was decided, Sir, that the Institute should be continued and should not be closed down solely because there was some loss incurred over that. An educational institution cannot necessarily be run as a commercial concern.”

Encouragement of cottage industries.

*744 Q.—MR. K. V. R. SWAMI: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(a) how far the survey of cottage industries has been carried out;

(b) whether the Government has formed any idea of encouraging any of the cottage industries;

(c) which of the industries the Government will encourage;

(d) what steps will be taken towards such encouragement; and

(e) the amount of money that will be spent for this purpose?

A.—(a) The survey has been completed in the Cuddapah and Bellary districts.

(b) & (e) The report on the survey of the Cuddapah district is now under consideration. The report on the Bellary survey has not yet been received.

20th October 1927]

Registration

Restoration of the old registration fees for attendance at the residences of parties.

* 745 Q.—**MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur**: With reference to the answer to my question No. 728, answered on 31st March 1927, will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have again instructed the officers of the Registration department that the discretion given to them in the note to article 8 of the table of registration fees should be exercised in all deserving cases;

(b) if so, what the number of cases of such remission is since the instruction was given; and

(c) whether the Government will be pleased to restore the old fees for attendance at the residence of the parties?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) Twelve.

(c) The matter is under the consideration of Government.

MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur:—“With reference to the answer to clause (c), will the hon. the Minister be pleased to state whether the matter is still under consideration, and if so, how long it will take the Government to come to a conclusion?”

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIAR:—“A conclusion may be come to in a few days, Sir.”

MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur:—“As this is a matter concerning the gosha ladies and poor people, will the Government come to a conclusion without further delay?”

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIAR:—“I have already said that in a few days the Government will come to a decision, and I hope the hon. Member will be satisfied then.”

Religious and Charitable Endowments

Retention of service inams by devadasis.

* 746 Q.—**MR. P. ANJANEYULU**: Will the hon. the Minister for Development and the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any memorial or resolutions from the Kalavantula community requesting them to make suitable amendments to the Hindu Religious Endowments Act so as to enable devadasis to retain their service inams by performing service through male members of their families; and

(b) what action the Government have taken thereon?

A.—(a) The Government have recently received a letter from the hon. Member, enclosing a copy of the resolutions passed at a conference held by members of the Kalavantula community on 7th August 1927 at Brucepet, Bellary. In the resolutions passed at this conference the members of the community urge that the Hindu Religious Endowments Act should be amended

[20th October 1927]

so as to render illegal the performance of service in temples by dancing girls, and that the service inam lands should be granted on ryotwari patta. No reference is made to the performance of temple service by devadasis through the male members of the family.

About twenty memorials from certain members of the Kalavantula community in the districts of Ganjam, Vizagapatam, Kistna, Guntur, Bellary and Anantapur have recently been received by the Government. These memorials do not contain any request for the amendment of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act.

(b) The Government will consider the action to be taken.

Nominations to the Temple committees.

* 747 Q.—Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state who the members of the Legislative Council are who have been nominated by the Government since 4th December 1926 to the membership of the temple committees?

A.—A list is laid on the table. a

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Question 747 has been withdrawn since ; but, if it is the wish of the Government Member, the answer will go into the official report.”

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ I should like to answer it, Sir.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ It is a withdrawn question. The Standing Order is that if the Government Member wishes it, the answer will go into the official report.”

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ If the question had not been put on the agenda, it would have been all right, Sir ; but since it has been put on the agenda, I propose to answer it. Otherwise it would give a wrong impression.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Then it will go into the official report.”

Veterinary

Stipends sanctioned for the Veterinary Colleges.

* 748 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED : Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(a) the number of stipends sanctioned by the Government for the Veterinary Colleges, from year to year during the last seven years, and their value ;

(b) the reason for the decrease, if any, in the number of such stipends and in the value thereof, if any ;

(c) the number of stipends awarded to students of each community in each year during the last seven years ;

20th October 1927]

(d) the number of applicants from each community for admission into the Veterinary College and the number of students of each community actually admitted into the college for the past seven years;

(e) whether the Government are aware that the proportion of Muslim students selected this year is too inadequate and the proportion of stipends to Muslim students is still more inadequate; and

(f) whether it is a fact that good proportion of the stipends allotted by the Government is distributed among the students of the Veterinary College at Vizagapatam; if so, whether the Government will furnish the House with a statement of the proportion during the last five years?

A.—(a) & (b) From the year 1919 to the year 1923, 40 scholarships of Rs. 15 per mensem each were allowed annually at the Madras Veterinary College. In the year 1923 Government, on the recommendation of the Retrenchment Committee, reduced the annual number of scholarships to 15 of Rs. 15 per mensem each.

(c) & (d) A statement* is appended.

(e) Of the 24 Muhammadan applicants, seven were admitted, of whom three have been given stipends out of the 15 stipends.

(f) There is no Veterinary College at Vizagapatam.

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—“ May I know whether it is proposed to increase the number of stipends from the ensuing year? ”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—(After a pause) “ There is no request from the Treasury Bench for a repetition of the question.”

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ I am sorry, Sir, I was inattentive.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The hon. Member is requested to repeat his question.”

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—“ May I know from the hon. the Minister whether it is proposed to increase the number of stipends from next year onwards? ”

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ One of the demands that have to be moved is for that purpose, and I hope it will be reached.”

Functions and powers of the Selection Committee for the Veterinary College.

* 749 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED : Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Selection Committee for the Veterinary College has no defined functions to discharge and no definite powers to exercise; and

(b) whether the Principal of the Veterinary College at Madras has made any reference to the Government in regard to the Selection Committee and whether the Government will place a copy of the reference on the table of the House, with the orders of the Government passed thereon?

[20th October 1927]

- A.—(a) The function of the Committee is to assist the Principal of the College with advice in the matter of selecting students for admission into the College.
- (b) No such communication from the Principal was received by the Government.

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—“ May I know, Sir, whether it is proposed to abolish the Selection Committee for the Veterinary College ? ”

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ I do not see any suggestion in the answer to warrant such a question, Sir ? ”

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—“ I want to know whether there is any proposal to abolish the Committee, Sir.”

The hon. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ Not so far as I know, Sir.”

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—“ I want to know whether he will consider any such proposal.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I think the supplementary question is far from the question put on paper.”

Excise

Steps taken towards complete prohibition.

* 750 Q.—Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have decided to take during this year the first step towards complete prohibition ;

(b) in how many districts the Government intend to introduce total prohibition ;

(c) whether the Government will also include the Kistna district among them ; and

(d) whether the Government propose to apply local option in all municipalities immediately ?

A.—No decision has yet been made by the Government.

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“ May I know whether the Government have not decided even to take the first step during the current year towards prohibition ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ No, Sir.”

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“ May I know, with reference to the answer to clause (d), whether they are prepared to consider at least the question of local option in view of the fact that the hon. the Excise Minister has mentioned in his speeches made on the floor of this House that the policy is to have prohibition as the goal ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ No, Sir.”

Mr. P. C. VENKATAPATI RAJU :—“ May I know, Sir, whether the Government have considered the matter, and when they will come to a decision on the matter ? ”

20th October 1927]

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" As I said on a previous occasion the matter is under consideration and I think a decision will be come to as early as possible."

Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI :—" May I ask; Sir, whether it is a fact that a certain Prohibition Bill or a Local Option Bill has been prepared and perused by the hon. Minister ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I am unable to give the information."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" May I ask whether the hon. Minister has been saying that two districts have been selected for total prohibition being tried this year ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" No, Sir, not in that form."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" May I know, Sir, how long it will take the Government to come to a decision ? "

The proposed total prohibition of liquor and the means for making up the loss of excise revenue.

* 751 Q.—Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI : Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health and the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state— 11-30 a.m.

(a) whether the Government placed before the Finance Committee any suggestions regarding the ways and means for making up of the loss of excise revenue due to the proposed attaining of total prohibition at the end of twenty years;

(b) whether Government have any intention of using the contribution now released by the Central Government for this purpose; and

(c) whether facilities were given to the Finance Committee to meet at any time after its formation for the purpose of finding out ways and means for making up the loss of excise revenue?

A.—(a) The Government have not placed before the Finance Committee any suggestions of the kind referred to. It is the Finance Committee which has, in paragraph 9 of G.O. No. 1576, Revenue, dated 17th September 1926, been requested to examine the question and advise the Government on the possibility of securing adequate new sources of revenue. No suggestions have yet been received from the Committee. No proposal for the attainment of total prohibition within any specified period has been formulated by the Government.

(b) The answer is in the negative.

(c) The Finance Committee for 1926-27 considered the question and asked for further information on certain points indicated in item (i) under section (iv) of the proceedings of the ninth meeting of the Committee held on the 3rd March 1927. This will be supplied to the Committee as soon as the information which the Government have called for from the Commissioner of Excise, has been received.

[20th October 1927]

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—" May I know why the Government are reluctant to place any suggestions before the Finance Committee which is going into the question of finding out ways and means to replace this loss of revenue ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" The Government are not at all reluctant, Sir. Information was called for by the Finance Committee and the Government have furnished part of it."

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—" Will the Government take any initiative in the matter and make suggestions to the Committee so that they may arrive at a speedy conclusion ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I said, Sir, that the Finance Committee had asked for information and that the Government had supplied part of the information and would supply further information as early as they can."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member's question was whether the Government would take the initiative by making suggestions to the Finance Committee ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I think that point too is under consideration."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" May I know whether the hon. Minister has selected Nellore as one of the two districts in which prohibition should be tried, and if so whether he made that statement in the Council in his personal capacity or in his capacity as Minister ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I did not make a statement in that form, Sir."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" Whatever be the exact form, did the hon. Minister not make a statement to the effect that Nellore would be one of the two districts where prohibition is likely to be introduced ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" What I said was that if and when prohibition is decided upon by Government, I would be willing to consider the case of Nellore."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Sir, with reference to the answer to (b), may I ask for elucidation whether the answer refers to the appropriation of the contribution this year or whether it refers to the future years also ? Am I to understand that the Government have made up their minds to use no part of this remitted amount towards making up for loss of revenue under Excise ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" The Government have not made up their mind."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" May I know what exactly is the meaning of the answer to the question, whether the Government have any intention of using the remitted contribution for this purpose, 'The answer is in the negative' ? In view of the answer just given to my supplementary question, am I to understand that the Government have not decided the question ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" No, Sir. The Government have not decided the question at all. It may be that when the matter is finally decided, the Government will have to take action but as yet they have not come to any conclusion."

20th October 1927]

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" Sir, it is stated in the answer to (c) that the Finance Committee asked for certain information on the 3rd March 1927. May I know why there has been this long delay in supplying the information and when it is likely to be furnished to the Committee? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" Part of the information, as I already said, has been supplied. A great deal of the information they have asked for is a matter for the Commissioner for Excise to work out in detail, necessarily a thing in which he could not give an offhand reply but has to consult his officers."

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—" Is it likely that the hon. Minister will take two years more till his term runs out, for furnishing this information? "

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" May I know whether the hon. Minister applied for appropriating any portion of the remitted amount to be used as compensation against the possible loss of revenue if prohibition is introduced? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I am sorry I cannot give the information."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" Then may I take it, Sir, that when the hon. Minister said that the Government did not propose utilizing the amount, it was his individual view, or may I know whether it was the opinion of the Cabinet? "

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I do not think that the question can be put in that form."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" May I know whether it is the intention of the Government not to begin prohibition until they levy new taxes? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I cannot answer that, Sir. The whole question is under consideration."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" Including the attempt to levy new taxes? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I am sorry I cannot answer that."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" May I know, Sir, whether the utilization of the remitted contribution either wholly or in part is under consideration for this purpose? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I think, Sir, I have made matters clear. The whole thing is under the consideration of the Government. As the whole thing is confidential, I am not in a position to answer the question."

Medical

Milk account in the Royapetta Hospital.

* 752 Q.—Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have looked into the milk account and inspection newly introduced in the Royapetta Hospital;

[20th October 1927]

(b) whether there is any improvement in the quality of milk now supplied to the patients; and

(c) whether they propose to introduce the same system in the General Hospital?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) Milk of good quality has always been supplied to the patients.

(c) The same system has been in vogue in the General Hospital, Madras, for many years.

Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR :—" May I know whether a similar system is adopted in the mufassal as that which obtains in the Royapetta and General Hospitals? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I should like to have notice of the question."

Unani Assistant for the Government School of Indian Medicine.

*753 Q.—Mr. C. S. GOVINDARAJA MUDALIYAR : Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government advertised for the post of a Unani Assistant for the Government School of Indian Medicine and if so, in what papers and on how many occasions;

(b) how many applications were received for the said post and whether the Government will be pleased to lay on the table a tabulated statement of the applications received with their qualifications and other particulars;

(c) whether the Government have made the appointment and if so, who is the candidate appointed and what reasons led to this particular candidate alone being appointed;

(d) whether he satisfied himself as to the competency of the candidate for the post before appointing him to the same, and if not, on what basis the appointment was made;

(e) whether it is not a fact that the said newly-appointed Unani Assistant does not hold any diploma from any recognized Unani College or School and that he has not undergone any regular course even under any recognized and reputed unani hakeem in Madras or outside and also that he was not an active and practising hakeem at the time of his appointment;

(f) whether there has been any advisory committee appointed for the selection of the Unani Assistant, and if so, the persons who constituted the said committee;

(g) whether it is not a fact that at least one member of the committee is not a practising unani hakeem at all but only styles himself as such;

(h) whether it is not a fact that the recommendation of the said advisory committee was not based on any recognized method or principle of selection but purely on individual patronage; and

(i) whether the Government will be pleased to reconsider the appointment and take necessary early steps to put the out-patient department in the hands of a competent and qualified Unani Assistant?

20th October 1927]

4.—(a) The Principal, School of Indian Medicine, advertised the vacancy on two occasions in the following papers :—

First occasion—

The Justice.
The Madras Mail.
The Hindu.
The Daily Express.

Second occasion—

The Justice.
The Madras Mail.
The Hindu.
The Daily Express.
The Paisa Akhbar (Lahore).

- (b) The number of applications received on the two occasions were eight and nine respectively. The Government do not consider it necessary to lay on the table a tabulated statement showing the qualifications, etc., of the several applicants.
- (c) The Government have appointed Janab Syed Husain-ud-din Hussaini as he was considered to be the most suitable candidate for the post.
- (d) Yes.
- (e) The Unani Assistant does not hold a diploma. He has studied Unani Medicine in Madras, Delhi and Lahore as detailed below :—

(1) *Madras*.—Five years under the late Hakeem Hyder Husan Sahib, Triplicane.

(2) *Delhi*.—Three years under Ali Janab Molvi Hakim Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib and Ali Janab Shifa-ul-Mulk Hakeem Raziyyuth-theem Ahmad Khan Sahib.

(3) *Lahore*.—Six months under Hakim Feroziddin Sahib.

He has been practising as a hakeem for the last ten years.

(f) Yes. The members of the Advisory Committee were—

- (1) Janab Hakeem T. Zyn-ul-labudeen Sahib Bahadur, Shifa-ul-Mulk
- (2) Janab Hakeem Haji Abdul Aziz Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.
- (3) Hakeem Peer Medani Sahib Bahadur.
- (4) M.R.Ry. G. Srinivasamurti Avargal, Principal, School of Indian Medicine.

First two gentlemen are non-officials.

- (g) The first of the two non-official members named in (f) above, is a practising hakeem of long standing and great reputation; the second, though not practising as a hakeem, has been connected, for many years, with the management of the Unani Tibbi College, Triplicane, and the Eastern Medical Association of South India, being one of its founders and also the Treasurer; he is also the Secretary of the Muslim High School. He belongs to a family, members of which have been Unani practitioners for generations.

[20th October 1927]

(h) The Government have no reason to think so.

(i) No. The Government have no reason to think that the outpatient department is in charge of an incompetent and unqualified officer.

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—" With reference to (a), may I know whether any advertisement was made in the local Urdu newspapers ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" It was not considered necessary, Sir."

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—" May I know whether it was the intention of the Government to give opportunity to local people to apply ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" Every possible opportunity was given, Sir."

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—" May I know what methods the Government adopted to make it possible for local Mussalmans who know only Urdu to send their applications ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" The information is here. The Government have advertised in the leading dailies of the city."

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—" May I know whether the hon. Minister is aware that these newspapers, *The Justice*, *The Madras Mail*, *The Daily Express* and *The Hindu* are published in English ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" Yes, Sir."

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—" Therefore, may I know if it was not the intention of the Government to call for applications from hakeems who are not expected to know much of English and much less, to read English newspapers ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" It is a matter of opinion."

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—" May I know from the hon. Minister whether the Government have assured themselves of the bona fides of these gentlemen who are called hakeems, where they were practising ? I ask the question with reference to (e), Sir."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I believe, Sir, the Advisory Committee satisfied itself as to this."

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—" May I know from the hon. Minister whether the Advisory Committee did not recommend on the first occasion another person than the one now appointed ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" That may be the case, Sir."

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—" May I know, then, Sir, why the advice of the Advisory Committee on the first occasion was not adopted ? "

20th October 1927]

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ It was considered that sufficient number of applications had not been received and with a view to get as large a number of applications as possible, it was considered desirable to call for fresh applications.”

MR. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—“ May I know what were the methods that were adopted by the Government for calling in more applications ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ We thought, Sir, that when we advertised in one of the papers in Northern India we would be able to get diplomates of the Tibbi College. That was done.”

Ayurvedic dispensaries under local bodies.

* 754 Q.—MR. K. V. R. SWAMI: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) the number of Ayurvedic dispensaries working under the local bodies ;

(b) the places where they are working ;

(c) the number of patients that are annually treated by each of these dispensaries ;

(d) persons in charge of these dispensaries and their qualifications ;

(e) whether the Government have received any reports from the local bodies concerned that these dispensaries are working satisfactorily ; and

(f) whether any grants are made to these dispensaries by the Government ?

A.—(a) At the end of the year 1925-26 local boards and municipal councils were maintaining respectively 51 and 26 dispensaries other than allopathic. The Government have no information as to how many of these were *Ayurvedic* institutions.

(b), (c) & (d) The Government have no information.

(e) The Government have not received any general report on the subject from local bodies. In a few cases local bodies have reported that particular dispensaries of this class were working satisfactorily.

(f) No.

MR. K. V. R. SWAMI :—“ With reference to (b), (c) and (d), will the hon. Minister be pleased to call for the information ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ I shall do so, Sir.”

MR. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“ May I know, Sir, with reference to (f), whether the Government are not prepared to make contributions to Ayurvedic dispensaries run by the local boards ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ Not at present, Sir.”

MR. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“ May I know when they would be prepared for it ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ At present I cannot give any more information than what I have already given. I propose that the whole thing should be considered.”

[20th October 1927]

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“ What arrangements has the Minister made for that consideration, may I know, Sir, whether he has appointed a committee or whether he is carrying on considerations in any other manner ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ I think, Sir, I said at the previous meeting of the Council that the Government were intending to depute the Principal of School of Indian Medicine to report to the Government about the action taken in other provinces in India and if this inspection is made and the report is received, the Government will then be in a position to consider the matter.”

Alleged prohibition of parents from staying in the General Hospital during nights.

*** 755 Q.—Mr. C. VENKATARAMAN NAYUDU** : Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state whether it is a fact that guardians or mothers of children even under three years of age admitted as in-patients into the General Hospital, Madras, are not allowed to stay with the children during nights and if so why ?

A.—Mothers of breastfed infants are always admitted into the hospital. In other cases the mothers are only admitted when the children are placed on the ‘ seriously ill ’ list by the Medical Officer in charge.

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“ May I know up to what age limit of children mothers are allowed ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ The answer gives the information, Sir.”

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“ Sir, there may be children of five or six years of age. Even such children are not to be with their mothers unless they happen to be seriously ill. Does it mean that ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ I think the answer is there, Sir.”

Public Health

Construction of leper asylums in the Presidency.

*** 756 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED** : Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are aware of the increasing number of lepers in the city of Madras and elsewhere ;

(b) whether the Government have taken any steps for the prevention of a free intermingling of the lepers with healthy citizens and for their isolation, and if not, why not ;

(c) whether the Government propose to extend the application of the Leper Act of 1898 to this Presidency and construct suitable asylums for the isolation of lepers and provide for their maintenance ; and

(d) whether the Government propose to set apart a sufficient sum of money for the purpose of constructing leper asylums in the necessary localities from out of the Provincial remissions ?

20th October 1927]

A.—(a) No. According to the census report of 1921 there has been in the Presidency a decline in the number of lepers from 16,858 in 1911 to 15,753 in 1921 and in the City a decline from 272 to 228.

(b) & (c) The Government do not consider that the extension of the Act III of 1898 would serve any useful purpose, as recent investigations made regarding the degree of infection of leprosy in its various stages have shown that the provisions of the Act are out of date.

(d) No. The Government are considering the question of dealing with the early infectious cases so as to prevent the spread of the disease and cure the persons afflicted with it.

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—“ May I know whether the Government will take any steps to prevent the vagabond lepers in the city of Madras from going about the streets ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ It is a matter for the police, Sir.”

Scarcity of drinking-water in Namakkal taluk.

* 757 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED : Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health and the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are aware that the ryots of Namakkal taluk in the district of Salem have been suffering from scarcity of drinking-water for the past five years ;

(b) whether the Government have received a memorial from the ryots of Namakkal recently regarding scarcity of drinking-water in the taluk, and whether the Government have investigated into the grievance of the ryots ;

(c) whether the Government have taken any steps to provide facilities for drinking-water to the ryots of the said taluk, and if so, whether the Government will be pleased to make a statement of the steps so far taken ;

(d) whether the Government propose to take such steps as may be necessary to permanently remove the scarcity of drinking-water from the taluk of Namakkal and whether the Government have considered any scheme therefor and if so, to place the same on the table of the House ;

(e) whether the Government has at any time considered the question of supplying water facilities to Namakkal by the construction of a channel from the Mettur dam, and if not, whether they propose to institute an investigation of the scheme ; and

(f) whether the Government have sunk any wells for relieving the scarcity of drinking-water in Namakkal, and if not, whether they propose to take steps to sink a sufficient number of wells at an early date ?

A.—(a) The Collector reported in January 1927 that there was scarcity of drinking-water in the taluk.

The Government are not aware that there has been a scarcity of water for the past five years.

(b) No memorial has been received from the ryots of Namakkal on the subject.

[20th October 1927]

- (c), (d) & (f) The provision of an adequate supply of drinking-water in the area under its control is primarily the duty of the local board concerned. The Government have made the following grants for the improvement of the water-supply in the rural areas of the Salem district during the past two years :—

		Amount allotted.	Amount spent.
		RS.	RS.
1925-26		20,000	16,116
1926-27		8,634	8,634
1927-28		6,329	...

The Government are considering the question of making an additional grant for the same purpose during the current year and of further grants in subsequent years.

The Government do not propose to take any other steps for the improvement of the water-supply in the Namakkal taluk. It is for the taluk board concerned to sink the required number of wells, meeting the expenditure involved from its own funds and such funds as may be placed at its disposal by the district board out of the Government grants.

- (e) The question of supplying Namakkal with drinking-water from Mettur does not seem to have been considered. The Government have considered the possibility of supplying water for the irrigation of 27,000 acres of land in the Salem district from Mettur ; but the idea has been given up as serious engineering difficulties would be involved and the proposal would not be financially profitable. The Government do not propose to make the investigation now.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ For the benefit of Members who were not present when the names were called, I will now take the House through the second round of questions.”

Inferior Service

Pay of dufterbunds in Tahsildars' offices and Stationary Magistrates' courts

* 768 Q.—Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are aware that the ‘dufterbunds’ in the Tahsildars’ offices and the Stationary Magistrates’ courts are generally made to do the work of clerks also ; and

(b) whether, having regard to this fact, the Government intend raising the pay of these ‘dufterbunds’ from Rs. 12—18 to Rs. 25—35 ?

A.—(a) & (b) If by the term ‘dufterbunds’ attenders are meant, the hon. Member is referred to the answers to clauses (b), (c) and (d) of question No. 2444 given in the Legislative Council on 2nd September 1926.

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“ May I know from the hon. the Revenue Member whether, before the introduction of this scale in 1920 and before the School Final was fixed as the minimum qualification, these dufterbunds or attenders were not in some cases acting as clerks ? ”

20th October 1927]

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—" A great number of unpassed people were acting as clerks and I have no doubt that some dufterbunds were also amongst them."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" May I know whether among them there were not people who had passed the Village Officers test ? "

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—" Very possibly, Sir. But I do not know for certain."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" May I know whether there are not among them men with fifteen years service and more ? "

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I am not able to understand how all these questions arise."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" Sir, they arise for this reason. The answer refers to an earlier answer and the question that has been asked is whether they were not doing the work of clerks and whether the increments should not be given to them."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The qualifications of these persons do not arise on this question."

Irrigation (Water-rate)

Renewal of the contract with the Tinnevely Mills, Limited.

* 712 Q.—Mr. CHAVADI K. SUBRAHMANYA PILLAI : With reference to the answers given to questions No. 839 (a) to (e) answered on 31st March 1927, will the hon. the Member for Revenue and the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any representations from the owners of lands irrigated under the Kodaimelalagyan anicut against the renewal of licence to the Tinnevely Mills, Limited; and what relief is proposed to be given to them;

(b) whether the Government have consented to storage by the Mills in a large reservoir of water overnight and thus delaying the return of water forthwith to the river;

(c) whether the Government have ascertained the quantity of power generated and used by the Mills with the water from the Papanasam falls;

(d) whether the Government have taken advice from technical experts about the relative cost of water power as generated and used by the Mills, and of the same quantity of power from any other power producer such as steam and oil engines;

(e) if so, whether the Government will be pleased to lay it on the table;

(f) if the Government have not taken such advice, why has not such advice been taken and whether the Government are prepared to take such advice now at least; and

(g) whether the Government will be pleased to postpone the renewal of the contract with the Tinnevely Mills, Limited, till after full enquiries as to the adequacy of the rent reserved by the Government and till after discussion of the matter in the Legislative Council?

[20th October 1927]

- 4.—(a) The Government received a copy of a notice of suit sent to the Collector of Tinnevely by Pattadars under the North and South Kodaimelalagyan channels. The latter part of the question is not understood.
- (b) The construction of a storage reservoir was sanctioned by the Government in 1906. The Government have no reason to suppose that there is any appreciable delay in the return of the water to the river.
- (c) The horse-power developed at the Mills is about 1,175.
- (d) & (e) No such expert advice was taken.
- (f) The Government saw no necessity for taking such advice.
- (g) The Government have passed orders sanctioning the renewal of the lease.

Mr. DANIEL THOMAS:—“May I know for what length of time the water was allowed to remain in the reservoir?”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS:—“Notice, Sir.”

Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—“May I know when the Government passed orders sanctioning the new reservoir, the month and date of the order?”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS:—“I want notice, Sir.”

Civil Justice

Communal representation in the Judicial department, Guntur, Nellore and Chittoor.

* 716 Q.—MUHAMMAD KHADIR MOHIDIN SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Law Member and the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the proportion of the various communities in the higher and lower grades up to Rs. 35 in the Judicial department of the Guntur, Nellore and Chittoor districts;

(b) whether it is a fact that the non-Brahman proportion in the higher grades has been decreasing day by day in the above districts;

(c) what steps have been taken to maintain the existing non-Brahman proportion;

(d) whether it is a fact that the claims of duly qualified non-Brahmans are not considered in filling up vacancies in the higher grades; and

(e) whether it is a fact that Brahmins who are debarred, suspended and condemned are given promotions?

A.—(a) A statement showing the proportion of the various communities in the higher and lower grades of the clerical service in the Judicial department of the Guntur, Nellore and Chittoor districts is appended.)

(b) No.

(c) The District Judges concerned report that where non-Brahmans of equal qualifications are available they are preferred to Brahmins.

20th October 1927]

(d) No.

(e) The Government has no reason to suppose that such promotions are given as a matter of practice as suggested in the question. But such cases have occurred—vide the answer to clause (a) (iii) of question No. 521.

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—“ May I ask the hon. Member as to whether he will be pleased to investigate into the reasons why such disparity exists between the representatives of the various communities in the district ? ”

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—“ The Government do not propose to make any special enquiry. Returns are received every year and when they are examined the question is considered then whether any action is necessary.”

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—“ May I know, Sir, whether the Government will take immediate steps to remove this disparity at least now ? ”

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—“ I do not think any further steps are necessary than those already taken.”

Corporation of Madras

Alleged insult to the President of the Corporation of Madras.

* 730 Q.—Mr. C. S. GOVINDARAJA MUDALIYAR : Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government and the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that Mr. J. Venkatanarayana Nayudu, the Commissioner of the Corporation of Madras, had, after the termination of the Council meeting held on 9th August 1927, used offensive and improper language to the President of the Corporation while the latter was about to enter his car in the presence of councillors and the office and menial staff for having read out at the meeting of the Council a statement prepared by Dr. Mallayya based on an inspection of the Tondiarpet Isolation Hospital in the company of the President ;

(b) whether it is a fact that the President called on the hon. Minister for Public Health immediately after the occurrence and reported to him the details of the insult offered to him ; and

(c) whether the Government propose to take notice of the conduct of Mr. Nayudu, the Commissioner ?

A.—(a) The Government are not aware of the incidents mentioned in the clause.

(b) Yes.

(c) No.

Mr. C. S. GOVINDARAJA MUDALIYAR :—“ May I ask the hon. the Minister for Public Health with reference to the answer to clause (a) whether the incident stated therein tallies with the oral representation made to him by the President when he called upon him immediately after the incident had occurred ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ I think the answer is here. The President did make the complaint, but I told him that I would not take any action unless an official complaint in writing was made.”

[20th October 1927]

Mr. C. S. GOVINDARAJA MUDALIYAR :—" I ask, Sir, whether the oral representation tallies with the incidents as have been stated in clause (a)."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I cannot vouch for the fact that the language was offensive and improper, but he said it was objectionable."

Mr. C. S. GOVINDARAJA MUDALIYAR :—" Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to permit the President to institute criminal proceedings for an offence under the insult section against the Commissioner ? "

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I want to know how the supplemental question is intended to elucidate the answer given. How does permission to institute criminal proceedings arise out of this ? "

Mr. C. S. GOVINDARAJA MUDALIYAR :—" It arises out of clause (c). The question is whether the Government propose to take notice of the conduct of Mr. Nayudu, the Commissioner? The answer thereto is, no. I want the Minister to tell us whether he will permit the President to institute criminal proceedings against the Commissioner because it arose out of an official transaction and he is an officer of the Government deputed by the Government."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question does not arise I would advise the hon. Member to give notice of a separate question."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" May I ask the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government why Government do not take any steps in view of the admission in clause (b) that the President called on the hon. Minister for Public Health and reported the details of the incident to him? In view of the answer which admits the insult, may I ask why the Government do not take any notice ? "

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" For the simple reason that the President did not choose to come to the Minister in charge even after the hon. the Minister for Public Health told him that it would be better for him to put it in writing."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Does the hon. Minister want that it should be put in writing when the President of the Corporation of Madras goes to him in person and reports to one of them? Is it because they consider that he is untrustworthy and that his words cannot be given any weight and so they insist on his putting it into writing just as the police do ? "

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" I do not mean that it should be a complaint. It may be an official communication."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Should it be in writing ? "

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" All official communications are in writing, Sir."

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—" Did the Government take any pains to get themselves acquainted with it ? "

Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—" May I know if the Commissioner himself has made any statement in the matter personally or in writing ? "

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" No."

20th October 1927]

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" May I know from the hon. the Minister for Public Health what the President actually told the Minister ? "

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The answer is that the Government are not aware. Perhaps the hon. Minister wants to make the distinction between his personal capacity and the Government. "

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" May I know, Sir, then if the President of the Corporation of Madras saw the hon. the Minister in the Secretariat rooms or in his bungalow ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" In my bungalow, Sir. "

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" Did he see the hon. Minister as Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar or as the hon. Minister for Public Health ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I am not sure what was in my mind at the time. "

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" With reference to clause (b), Sir, may I know what are the details of the insult offered to him which the President reported to the hon. Minister for Public Health immediately after the occurrence ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I do not remember it exactly except this. I thought the President told me that the language used was not proper and that it was objectionable. "

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" In view of that statement, may I ask the hon. the Minister for Public Health or the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government why they considered it necessary that the Commissioner should be allowed to be going about insulting the President and why they do not propose to take any action ? "

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBAYAN :—" The answer is that Government are not aware of any such insult. "

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I think really there is some difficulty in the matter. Standing Order 11 (i) says: A question addressed to a Member of the Government must relate to the public affairs with which he is *officially* connected, or to a matter of administration for which he is responsible. From the answers it is clear that the hon. Minister for Public Health was the person approached by the President. I think the hon. the Minister for Public Health is not the person officially connected with the Commissioner of the Corporation. Therefore any conversation that took place between the President of the Corporation and the hon. Minister for Public Health cannot be taken as one that took place between them in their official capacities. If the hon. Members are so willing, it is better to address further questions on the point to the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government if any such conversation took place. "

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Then may I take it that there is no connexion between the Commissioner and the Government in respect of this matter ? "

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Yes, that is the reason why they say there is no complaint to the Government. "

[20th October 1927]

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" May I make a submission ? If the Commissioner of the Corporation is an officer of the Government whose conduct has to be enquired into . . . "

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" His conduct ought to have been brought to the notice of the Minister for Local Self-Government and not the Minister for Public Health."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" In answer to clause (c) they say the Government do not propose to take notice of the conduct of Mr. Nayudu. Is it, in the opinion of the Government that it is a trivial matter to insult the President, the honorary President of a big City like the Corporation of Madras ? "

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" For the simple reason that they are not aware of any such insult."

Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYA :—" With regard to officers above a certain status, is it not a fact that the complaints should be followed by a resolution of the local bodies concerned ? "

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" I submit, Sir, that this is a question which does not arise and it is also a hypothetical question."

Srikan BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya :—" Now that the Government are aware of the insult offered to the President of the Corporation, will they now at least take the trouble to enquire into the matter ? "

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The answer is that the Government are not aware."

Srikan BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya :—" After the interpellations and discussions, at least now will the Government take the necessary action ? "

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" I maintain that even now Government are not aware of any such insult."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" None so blind as those who will not see."

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—" There are certain details . . . "

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member is making a speech."

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—" May I know whether the Government will be pleased to make an enquiry and tell us what the incidents are ? "

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" No, Sir."

Local Boards

Nomination of Christians to represent the Hindu depressed classes in local boards and municipalities.

* 736 Q.—Mr. S. VENKAYYA : Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that there is no representation of the Adi-Andhras in the Gudivada Union Board, Kistna district ;

(b) if the Government are aware that there is no such representation, what steps have they taken to remedy the defect ;

(c) whether the Government are aware of the nomination of Christians to represent the Hindu depressed classes in local boards and municipalities ;

20th October 1927]

(d) whether the Government have ever approved or condemned the system of nominating persons of a faith different from the faith of those whom they represent;

(e) whether the Government have considered whether any amendment to clause 5 of section 9 of the Local Boards Act is needed to prevent such wrong nominations being made; and

(f) if such an amendment is necessary, when they will make it?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government have no information. Under clause (c) of sub-section (4) of section 9 of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, members of union boards are appointed by presidents of taluk boards.

(c) Yes

(d) They have not disapproved. Depressed classes representatives are appointed to represent depressed classes and not the members of any particular religion.

(e) & (f) The Government do not consider that any such amendment is required.

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" May I know with reference to the answers to (a) and (b) whether they have attempted to get any information ? "

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" Yes, Sir."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" May I take it that the information has not yet reached ? "

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" We have not yet got the information."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" With reference to clause (d) may I know if they have approved of the nominations made on the lines suggested in the question ? They say they have not disapproved."

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" Government have neither approved nor disapproved."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The time allotted for the questions and answers now being over, the House will now proceed to the next order of the day."

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the member.]

III

AMENDMENTS TO THE STANDING ORDERS OF THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

(1)

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to present to the House the report of the Select Committee on the amendments of certain Standing Orders which I proposed some months ago. I shall take it for granted that the report is read by the House. After listening to the conclusions to which the Select Committee has arrived, I think with the permission of the House, it is necessary for me to reiterate my proposals for amending some of the Standing Orders. The first amendment relates to Standing Order No. 19. I propose to add a new clause or Order No. 19-A to this effect : ' 19-A. Every question admitted shall be given an answer with the information sought, unless the answer be against public interests.' Sir, this proposal of mine arises out of my points raised in the debates of the Council so early as

12 noon.

[Mr. J. A. Saldanha.]

[20th October 1927]

1st April 1925 and in my letter to the late President of the Legislative Council, dated 15th April 1925, for which I received a reply dated 28th July 1925, which is an evasive reply to my question."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"At this stage, the hon. Member should merely present the report of the Select Committee. He need not now take the House through the history of the amendments proposed by him."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I have presented the report, and I am going to move that my amendments may be carried."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"That is another stage. The hon. Member will kindly see from the agenda that he is now expected only to move that the amendments as reported by the Select Committee be taken into consideration. That is the motion he has to make."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I am thankful for the relief, Sir, as I am myself not quite well just now. I shall be glad simply to move that the report of the Select Committee be taken into consideration."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"If the hon. Member is not keeping good health, I would advise him to have this postponed to some other date."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I have been trying to find the Standing Order by which I could do it." (Laughter.)

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member may withdraw his motion or he may have it postponed to some later day."

* Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I move that this item on the agenda be taken up on Saturday next."

* Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I second it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The question is that item (1) of Orders of the Day No. I be postponed to next Saturday. That includes all the amendments of Mr. Saldanha."

The motion was put and carried.

(2)

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The next item on the agenda is a motion by Mr. D. Narayana Raju for certain amendments to Standing Orders. Under Standing Order 76, I have now to read the draft amendments and ask whether the hon. Member has the leave of the Council. As the amendments are lengthy and as they are in the hands of the hon. Members they may be taken as read by me. I now enquire whether any objection is taken to these amendments. (After a pause). Since no objection has been taken I have to intimate that Mr. D. Narayana Raju has the leave of the Council.

"The draft amendments have now to be referred to a Select Committee. Six members of the Select Committee have to be selected by the Council by means of the single transferable vote in accordance with the regulations framed in this behalf. I would suggest that these amendments may be referred to the same Select Committee as may be constituted to consider the draft amendments of the hon. the Advocate-General, moved yesterday. I fix 2 p.m. to-day as the time within which nominations may be handed in to the Secretary. I appoint Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu, being a Chairman of the Council, to be a member of the Committee."

20th October 1927]

IV

BILLS TO AMEND THE ANDHRA UNIVERSITY ACT.

MR. P. C. VENKATAPATI RAJU :—“ With reference to these Bills, I have to say one word, Sir. There are many Bills to amend the Andhra University Act, and unfortunately there are also other Bills coming in between the amending Bills of the Andhra University Act. So, I should like to move that all the Bills relating to the Andhra University Act be taken up together, and the Bills that are intervening between these amending Bills may come after the Bills for the amendment of the Andhra University Act are disposed of.”

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ I second it, Sir.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I do not think this is a proper stage for making such a motion because the items are not to be adjourned. However, if the House is of opinion that all these Bills relating to the Andhra University Act might be taken together, I think, I might as a special case allow a motion like this : that items Nos. 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12 and 16 may be taken in their order after the other items have been disposed of, that is, after item No. 17. I take it that the motion is put in that form.”

MR. P. C. VENKATAPATI RAJU :—“ Yes, Sir.”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR.—“ Though all these items are connected with the Andhra University Act, some are for actual introduction of the amending Bills and some only for leave to introduce.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ All those matters will be disposed of together. The question is that items Nos. 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12 and 16 may be taken after item No. 17.”

The motion was put and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Before we go to these Bills, I should like to point out that so far as the motions for the introduction of the several Bills to amend the Andhra University Act are concerned, they will be governed by Standing Order 38 (3) which says that at the stage of introduction of a Bill the principles of the Bill and its general provisions may be discussed.

“ So far as I have been able to gather, the principles underlying these Bills are : (1) whether it is desirable to have the headquarters and a centre at one and the same place ; (2) if so, whether the present headquarters should be made a centre or the headquarters shifted to any one of the present centres ; (3) if it is to be shifted, on what principles the centre should be chosen ; (4) whether the number of centres should be increased or whether it should be reduced to one ; and (5) if so, on what principles the centres to be added or abolished are to be chosen.

“ I would deprecate any debate on the relative merits of the various places at this stage.”

1. A BILL TO AMEND THE ANDHRA UNIVERSITY ACT.

* Mr. C. RAMASOMAJULU :—“ Sir, I beg to introduce the Bill^a to amend the Andhra University Act and move that it be read in Council. My Bill, Sir, is to the effect that the headquarters of the University might be placed at

^a Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 20th September 1927 (as Bill No. 16 of 1927).

[Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu]

[20th October 1927]

Rajahmundry and that Rajahmundry be substituted in the place of Bezwada which is the present headquarters. As you have suggested, Sir, I do not wish to take much of the time of the Council by discussing about the relative merits of the different places. But I will only point out the necessity that has arisen for this readjustment. It may be within the knowledge of the House that after the Andhra University Act was passed,—after the several selections relating to the location of the headquarters and the centres have been accepted, after the principles behind those selections and all other things have been settled by the passing of the Andhra University Act—it so happened, either perhaps because the principles behind these decisions have been found to be unworkable or otherwise undesirable, that it has been found by the academic body that a change is necessary. The academic body itself, i.e., the Senate, took the lead in the matter by deciding that the headquarters must be in a place which is also a University centre. The academic body later on decided that instead of only three centres there might be a fourth centre too. And the Syndicate, the academic body within the academic body—that is the real academic body—decided that the centre existing at one place must be removed to a different place altogether. So much so, it is felt absolutely necessary that a reshuffling is necessary. That is all I would say at the present stage to the House without entering into other controversial matters. Therefore, it has been found necessary that persons holding different views have to adumbrate those views in the shape of a Bill of their own, so that we find nine Bills have been given notice of and leave has been obtained for all these Bills. So, Sir, I had to give notice of this Bill, and I may point out to the House that it was felt as though Rajahmundry which was almost accepted to be the headquarters when the Act was about to be passed had to remain content with being a mere University centre. As it has been said, subsequent events threatened to deprive Rajahmundry of its being even the centre. Even at the time of the passing of the Act, it was accepted as a centre. So much so, a number of circumstances have arisen which have put people on the alert, and this readjustment which is found necessary by the Senate itself is also felt necessary by the lay people outside, and thus it was that all these Bills have come into being. At this stage, I do not wish to discuss the relative merits of all these Bills, as you have yourself suggested. All these Bills will necessarily go before the Select Committee and I think the whole matter will then be properly scrutinized, when every modification that is suggested and that is found necessary since the passing of the Andhra University Act will necessarily receive that fuller consideration which will result in coming to an arrangement which will satisfy all persons concerned."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I second it."

The motion for introduction of the Bill to amend the Andhra University Act by Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu was then put and carried.

The Secretary then read the title of the Bill.

12-15
p.m.

* Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU :—"Sir, at this stage I wish to move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. According to the rules, as soon as the motion that the Bill be read in Council is passed"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I do not think any hon. Member has any objection to permit the hon. Member to refer his Bill to a Select Committee. But, before that motion is made I think it is better that all these Bills are read in Council so that the Council may then agree to refer all of them to one

20th October 1927]

[The President]

Select Committee. Therefore, when all the Bills given notice of are read in Council, there may be one single motion for referring them all to one Select Committee agreed upon by the Members of the House. Therefore for the present, I am asking the Members only to move that their Bills be read in Council."

2. A BILL TO AMEND THE ANDHRA UNIVERSITY ACT.

Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU :—"Sir, I beg to move that my Bill ^a to amend the Andhra University Act, 1925, be read in Council.

"Sir, the Bill of which I have given notice refers to the shifting of the headquarters to one of the existing centres."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—"I second it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I take it that the House is in a mood to refer all these Bills to a single Select Committee. Of course I do not want to curtail the liberty of hon. Members to make elaborate references to the principles underlying their Bills. It may now be formally moved that each Bill be read in Council."

The motion was put and carried.

The Secretary read the title of the Bill.

3. A BILL TO AMEND THE ANDHRA UNIVERSITY ACT

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Mr. Anjaneyulu whose Bill comes up next, being not in his place . . ."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—"May I move it, Sir?"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I do not think it is permissible in the case of Bills."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"May I move it, Sir, with the permission of the Council?"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I think we shall summon the hon. Member (Mr. Anjaneyulu) from the lobbies. (Laughter.) (At this stage Mr. P. Anjaneyulu came into the Council.) I may bring to the notice of the hon. Member, Mr. P. Anjaneyulu, that the House has been courteous enough to wait for his arrival to move his motion."

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—"I thank the House, Sir. I formally move that my Bill ^b to amend the Andhra University Act, 1925, be read in Council.

"I very sincerely apologize for not having been in my place at the time when my name was called and I am very much obliged to the hon. Members and the President for the courtesy shown to me."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—"I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

The Secretary read the title of the Bill.

^a Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 20th September 1927 (as Bill No. 13 of 1927).

^b Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 20th September 1927 (as Bill No. 19 of 1927).

[20th October 1927]

4. A BILL TO AMEND THE ANDHRA UNIVERSITY ACT.

The ZAMINDAR of GOLLAPALLI :—"Sir, I move that my Bill ^a to amend the Andhra University Act, 1925, be read in Council."

Mr. G. PREMAYYA :—"I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

The Secretary then read the title of the Bill.

5. A BILL TO AMEND THE ANDHRA UNIVERSITY ACT.

Diwan Bahadur P. C. ETHIRAJULU NAYUDU :—"Mr. President, I move that my Bill ^b to amend the Andhra University Act be read in Council."

Rao Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—"I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

The Secretary then read the title of the Bill.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I wish to know whether Mr. K. V. R. Swami is very particular to move his Bill. Since his Bill is identical with that of Mr. Narayana Raju and since all these Bills are being referred to the same Select Committee, I do not think there is the question of one Member withdrawing his Bill without the knowledge of the other. Of course, it is a question of convenience."

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—"I am very desirous that my Bill also may be moved."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I think it is in order."

6. A BILL TO AMEND THE ANDHRA UNIVERSITY ACT.

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—"Sir, I move that my Bill ^c to amend the Andhra University Act be read in Council."

Mr. C. GOPALA MENON :—"I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

The Secretary read the title of the Bill.

7. A BILL TO AMEND THE ANDHRA UNIVERSITY ACT.

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—"Sir, I move to introduce a Bill ^d to amend the Andhra University Act and move that it be read in Council."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

The Secretary read the title of the Bill.

8. A BILL TO AMEND THE ANDHRA UNIVERSITY ACT.

Mr. C. OBI REDDI :—"Mr. President, Sir, I move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Andhra University Act and move that it be read in Council."

^a, ^b, ^c, ^d, Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 20th September 1927 (as Bills Nos. 19 of 1927, 18 of 1927, 21 of 1927, 12 of 1927 and 15 of 1927, respectively).

20th October 1927]

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

The Secretary read the title of the Bill.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" On a point of order, Sir. Will the mere granting of leave to introduce suffice to place this Bill also before the Select Committee along with the rest?"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I do not think the Standing Orders permit it and there is no provision in the Standing Orders to suspend the relevant Standing Order and take it on. Unfortunately I do not think it will be in keeping with the procedure prescribed in the Standing Orders to table a motion like that at this stage. Since the Council is meeting again in the first week of November, I shall see that this Bill is also published so that the hon. Member may perhaps find time to have his Bill introduced and referred to the same Select Committee."

9. A BILL TO AMEND THE ANDHRA UNIVERSITY ACT.

Mr. P. C. VENKATAPATI RAJU :—" I beg to introduce a Bill ^a to amend the Andhra University Act and move that it be read in Council."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

The Secretary then read the title of the Bill.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" If the number of Members on the Select Committee exceeds 15, the hon. the Minister for Education will have first to obtain the permission of the House to exceed that number as that is the number allowed on a Select Committee."

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" Sir, I move that the number of Members on the Select Committee dealing with all these Bills may exceed 15 as this is an important measure and a lot of people are interested in it, the amending Bills themselves numbering about 15."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" There seems to be a difficulty in one motion being made for all the Bills. The rule says that the Member in charge should make the motion that it be referred to a Select Committee. Each Member who is in charge of a Bill will therefore kindly make a formal motion that it be referred to a Select Committee."

Mr. C. RAMASOMAJULU :—" I move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Members mentioned in the list in the hands of the hon. the President."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" I second it."

^a Published in the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 20th September 1927, as Bill No. 14 of 1927.

[20th October 1927]

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that the Bill of Mr. Ramasomayajulu to amend the Andhra University Act be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members :—

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 11. Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed. |
| 2. " S. Satyamurti. | 12. " G. Harisarvottama Rao. |
| 3. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 13. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 4. " S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar. | 14. Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 5. Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 15. " D. Narayana Raju. |
| 6. " Daniel Thomas. | 16. " N. Siva Raj. |
| 7. The hon. the Minister for Education (Dr. P. Subbarayan). | 17. " S. N. Dorai Raja. |
| 8. The hon. the Advocate-General (Mr. T. R. Venkatarama Sastriyar). | 18. " V. Ch. John. |
| 9. Mr. R. M. Statham. | 19. " P. T. Rajan. |
| 10. " C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 20. " C. Obi Reddi. |
| | 21. " K. Koti Reddi, and the Mover." |

(A voice : " And all the other movers of amending Bills.")

12-30
p.m.

Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU :—" Apart from my anxiety to be on the Select Committee, the Statute itself says that I should be there."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" To the list already read, the following names are added :—

Mr. P. Anjaneyulu.
The Zamindar of Gollapalli.
Diwan Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu.
Mr. K. V. R. Swami.

Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao.
" P. C. Venkatapathi Raju.
" P. Siva Rao.
" A. V. Bhanoji Rao."

Mr. K. UPPI SAHIB :—" I propose Mr. Hameed Khan Sahib to be on the Select Committee."

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" I also propose Sir A. P. Patro to be on the Select Committee."

Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO :—" I beg to withdraw."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" I also propose that Messrs. Uppi Sahib and R. Srinivasa Ayyangar be added to the list of Members on the Select Committee."

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI :—" I propose some more names, Sir."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Let the proposition be put to vote. I now read the list of Members of the Select Committee. If hon. Members want to add or to take away any names, they are at liberty to propose any amendments.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 17. Mr. N. Sivaraj. |
| 2. " S. Satyamurti. | 18. " S. N. Dorai Raja. |
| 3. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 19. " V. Ch. John. |
| 4. " S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar. | 20. " P. T. Rajan. |
| 5. Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 21. " C. Obi Reddi. |
| 6. " Daniel Thomas. | 22. " K. Koti Reddi. |
| 7. The hon. Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 23. " C. Ramasomayajulu. |
| 8. The Advocate-General (Mr. T. R. Venkatarama Sastriyar). | 24. " P. Anjaneyulu. |
| 9. Mr. R. M. Statham. | 25. Zamindar of Gollapalli. |
| 10. " C. R. Reddi. | 26. Diwan Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. |
| 11. " Basheer Ahmad Sayeed. | 27. Mr. K. V. R. Swami. |
| 12. " G. Harisarvottama Rao. | 28. " A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 13. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. | 29. " P. C. Venkatapathi Raju. |
| 14. Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi. | 30. " P. Siva Rao. |
| 15. " D. Narayana Raju. | 31. " A. V. Bhanoji Rao. |
| 16. The hon. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. | 32. " Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib." |

20th October 1927]

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" May I know what is the number ?"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" 32."

Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" I propose Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu to be a member of the Select Committee."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried and Mr. Muniswami Nayudu's name was included.

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" I propose two more names, viz., Messrs. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar and K. Uppi Sahib."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have to see that the numbers of the various parties are in proper proportion. If the Members of the Congress party add their own Members, they will be swelling their ranks in the Select Committee which would not be desirable."

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" In so far as the Select Committee of the Andhra University Bill is concerned, it does not seem to proceed upon party lines but upon parochial lines, namely, that Rajahmundry wants to be represented by a Member on the Select Committee, Bezvada wants to be represented by its own Member on the Select Committee and so on. I have tried to do my best to give representation to each district, but if each district wants that the number of its representatives should be correspondingly larger than other districts, then it will be exceedingly difficult to satisfy each district in that manner."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" It is my duty to bring to the notice of the House that the proportion of the Members of each party on the Select Committee correspond to its relative strength in the House."

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" May I propose at this stage that the number of Members of the Select Committee should not exceed 35?"

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" I second it."

The motion was put to vote and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" With the name of Mr. Muniswami Nayudu the number has come to 33."

The motion of Mr. Kaleswara Rao for adding the names of Messrs. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar and Uppi Sahib was put to vote and lost.

Mr. K. KOTTI REDDI :—" I propose that the names of Messrs. Abdul Hye Sahib and Mr. Sarabha Reddi be added."

The motion was put to vote and declared lost.

Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—" I propose Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar to be on the Select Committee."

The motion was put to vote and carried and Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar's name was included.

Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" I propose that the Raja of Panagal be added to the Select Committee."

The RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" I do not wish to be a member of the Select Committee."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" As the Raja of Panagal is not willing to be on the Select Committee, I do not think the House will be justified in including his name."

[20th October 1927]

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" I move that Mr. H. F. P. Hearson be included in the Select Committee."

The ZAMINDAR OF GOLLAPALLI :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried and Mr. H. F. P. Hearson was included.

Then the motion that the Select Committee shall compose of the 32 members as above referred to together with the names of Messrs. B. Muniswami Nayudu, S. Arpudasmami Udayar and H. F. P. Hearson, making in all 35, was put to vote and carried.

Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU :—" I move that my Bill be referred to the Select Committee consisting of the same Members as read by you."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" I second it."

The motion was carried.

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—" I move that my Bill be referred to the same Select Committee."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU :—" I move that my Bill be referred to the same Select Committee."

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

The ZAMINDAR OF GOLLAPALLI :—" I move that my Bill be referred to the same Select Committee."

Mr. F. H. P. HEARSON :—" I second it."

The motion was carried.

Diwan Bahadur P. C. ETHIRAJULU NAYUDU :—" I move that my Bill be referred to the same Select Committee."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—" I move that my Bill be referred to the same Select Committee."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" I propose that my Bill be referred to the same Select Committee."

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. P. C. VENKATAPATI RAJU :—" I move that my Bill be referred to the same Select Committee."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. C. OBI REDDI :—" I move that my Bill be referred to the same Select Committee."

20th October 1927]

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“ I second it.”

The motion was put and carried.

V

THE JAIN SUCCESSION BILL.

* Mr. K. R. KARANT :—“ Sir, I beg to introduce the Jain Succession Bill ^a and move that it be read in Council. I shall briefly state the main object and principle underlying this Bill. The Bill has been published as also the Statement of Objects and Reasons. As it will be evident from the Statement of Objects and Reasons, the Jains in South Kanara, consisting of about 9,000 persons, are governed by what is known as the Aliyasantana law, whereas Jains in the rest of India are governed by the ordinary Hindu law. They are mostly landlords. Even among the Jains in South Kanara the priestly class is governed by the ordinary Hindu law as also some leading families of whom I might mention Mr. Dharmastala Heggade who was a Member of the last Council. The Jains in South Kanara have found that this kind of succession, viz., Aliyasantana system by which the property goes to sisters and sisters' children, is not a very satisfactory system. For very many years they have been agitating and requesting the Government to introduce some legislation by which they might be governed by the ordinary Hindu law and that they might be brought into line with Jains in other parts of India. Memorials signed by many leading Jain citizens in that district were sent to the Government as early as 1918 and I might just read only one or two portions of the memorial as I do not wish to take much time of the Council. The memorial says : ‘ The Jain community has been holding conferences in this Presidency during the last six years with a view to concert measures for the advancement of the social, material and the spiritual progress of the community. Some steps have been taken to promote the education and knowledge of the community and it has been recognized in the country that the Aliyasantana system governing a large section of the community in South Kanara is a curse and a serious stumbling block to the path of progress.’ Lastly, the memorialists wind up by requesting His Excellency the Governor as follows :—‘ Your Excellency’s memorialists therefore humbly and respectfully pray that Your Excellency’s Government may, on a gracious consideration of the facts and circumstances stated above, be pleased to take on hand some legislative measure which will bring the Jain community in South Kanara now following the Aliyasantana rules of succession within the operation of the ordinary Hindu law.’ On this memorial the Government were pleased to obtain the opinion of the District Judge of South Kanara, of the Advocate-General and of the Judges of the High Court who all viewed this favourably and a G.O. No. 944, Judicial, Home Department, dated 29th April 1919, was passed to the following effect :—‘ The Government have consulted the hon. Judges of the High Court, the District Judges of South Kanara and the Advocate-General on the subject of the memorial submitted by the Jains of South Kanara and copies of the opinions received in reply are forwarded to the Collector of South Kanara for communication to the memorialists and Mr. Sadasiva Bhat. The Collector is requested to inform the memorialists that the Government, as at present advised, will not oppose the introduction, by a non-official Member in the Legislative Council, of a Bill to give effect to the general wishes of the com-

12-46
p.m.

^a Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 20th September 1927, as Bill No. 17 of 1927.

[Mr. K. R. Karant]

[20th October 1927]

munity.' In accordance with this, during the latter part of the last Council Mr. Dharmastala Heggade, who was a representative of the Jains in the last Council, obtained leave of the Council to introduce the very Bill which I have now brought forward before this Council. The Bill and the Statement of Objects and Reasons excepting a very small portion at the end are a copy exactly of his Bill and Statement of Objects and Reasons. It is the wish of the community unanimously in South Kanara that this Bill should be passed. As regards the Bill itself, it is almost a copy, verbatim, of the Mappilla Succession Act (Act I of 1918). If hon. Members will be pleased to see that Act, it will be found that in a very similar case the Government passed legislation that in the case of persons who die intestate, the self-acquired properties should go to their heirs as under the Muhammadan Law. Under the present Bill what is proposed is not to revolutionise the whole Aliyasantana law. This Bill introduces the least possible change in the existing system. It affects only the last surviving members of a family. If they die intestate or in the case of members who have got self-acquired properties, the Bill says that those properties shall descend to their children or to their heirs as under Mitakshara law and not to their sisters and sisters' children as it is at present. I do not wish to take more of the time of the Council. I regret there is not even a single Member in this Council who represents Jains. I hope the Council will pass the first reading of this Bill."

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—"I second this motion."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"It has been moved and seconded that the Jain Succession Bill be read in the Council."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Sir, I think there will be considerable difficulty in supporting the measure of my hon. Friend, Mr. Karant. I associate myself with him in his observation that it is a matter of regret that in this Council there is no member of the community that will be affected by this legislation. My hon. Friend has introduced the Bill for a change in the line of succession amongst the Jains who, according to him, form 9,000 of the population in the district of South Kanara. I think that a social legislation like this should be introduced by a member of the community that will be affected by the legislation. I made some enquiries of my hon. Friends from South Kanara district as to whether at the time of the elections to this Council there was any mandate given by the electorate to the members who have been sent up to this Council to introduce legislation of this kind. I am told that this was not one of the planks in the election platform."

Mr. K. R. KARANT :—"Question."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"I was given this information by a gentleman coming from South Kanara, who is also a Member of this Council. There is thus no mandate to my hon. Friend, Mr. Karant, for introducing legislation of this kind. Seeing that it is a matter of social legislation and seeing also that there is no member of the community that will be affected by it in the Council, I would not oppose the Bill if the Government themselves introduced it, because the Government have a responsibility in the matter. The Government are not introducing this measure. From the extract of the Government Order which my hon. Friend has read—the Government Order was issued long ago—it is seen that the Government did not propose to introduce such a legislation. If the Government take the responsibility of acceding to the request of my hon. Friend and if they are prepared to vote in favour of

20th October 1927]

[Mr M. Krishnan Nayar]

this measure, this part of my objection will not prevail. It seems to me that the Government themselves are not prepared to take the responsibility upon their shoulders of introducing a legislation of this kind; and there is no member of the community that is affected by the Bill in this Council. These are my preliminary objections to this measure.

"Going deeper into the matter, I find serious difficulties. What is sought to be introduced by this legislation is a change in the law of succession, only in respect of portions of properties and not in respect of all properties owned by families. What this Bill seeks to introduce is to make self-acquired properties descend to the heirs under the Mitakshara system, leaving untouched the succession of family properties or what are called tarwad properties. If this legislation becomes law, what will be the effect? In the same family there will be two systems of inheritance, viz., the system of Aliyasanthana so far as family properties are concerned and the system of Mitakshara law so far as self-acquired properties are concerned. I think that the provisions of this Bill will introduce considerable complications.

"Then there is another difficulty. What my hon. Friend has aimed at is the introduction of the Mitakshara Hindu law into the Aliyasantana system. We know that the Mitakshara system of Hindu law does not recognize the rights of women to properties. If this Bill becomes law, if a man who owns private property dies leaving a widow and daughters, the widow will have no right to the property and the daughters also will have no right except the right to enjoy the properties during their lifetime. That is against the fundamental principle of the Aliyasantana law. Aliyasantana system like Marumakkattayam law recognizes the rights of females to properties. According to the Aliyasantana system, the right of females is superior even to that of the males. Marumakkattayam system and the Aliyasantana system are the same with this difference. Under the Marumakkattayam system, only the eldest male members of the family are entitled to manage the property. Under the Aliyasantana system, the eldest member of the family, whether it be a male or a female, is entitled to manage the property. If my hon. Friend's Bill becomes law, widows and daughters and female issue of persons who die intestate will have no right whatever to inherit self-acquired properties. That, I submit, will be making a serious inroad into the principles governing the people. If my Friend had come forward with the proposal that if any person having self-acquired property dies intestate, his property would go to his wife and children, I would have had no objection. But that is not what he says. He wants to ignore the rights of women to such property. That goes to the root of the matter.

1 p.m.

"Then my Friend says that permission was granted by this Council to Mr. Heggade to introduce an identical Bill. It has become the practice and convention in this Council to give leave to introduce any measure, however vicious the measure may be; so that the fact that such leave to introduce the Bill was given does not show that the Bill has the approval of this Council. So, for these reasons, namely, that this a matter of social legislation, that no member of the community which is affected by this Bill is a member of this Council now, that the Government are not prepared to take up the responsibility of accepting this measure and that by the acceptance by this Council of this measure two systems of inheritance, viz., the Mitakshara law and the Aliyasantana law, will exist in the same family, and lastly that this Bill is against the basic principles of the Aliyasantana law, namely, that women

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

[20th October 1927]

also have a right to the property, for all these reasons I submit that this Council will not be well advised in accepting this motion."

* **Mr K. MADHAVAN NAYAR** :—" Sir, I have great pleasure in supporting my Friend Mr. Karant. Sir, the objections raised by my Friend Mr. Krishnan Nayar do not carry conviction. He says that there is no member of the Jain community in this House and that the Bill ought to be properly introduced by a member of the Jain community. Sir, there is no member of the Jain community in this House now and it is likely that the next Council also may not have any member of the Jain community. For several years to come it may so happen that this House contains no representative of the Jain community. The Government are not bringing forward any measure to remedy the evils which the Jain community is labouring under in South Kanara. Under these circumstances, the objection that this Bill is introduced by one who is no member of that community seems to me puerile.

" Further, Sir, Mr. Karant in his speech said that his Bill is practically a copy of the Bill that was introduced in this Council by a member of the Jain community who hailed from South Kanara last time into this Council. The very fact that he does not bring a new Bill but adopts a Bill which has been drafted by a member of the Jain community affords an almost complete answer to the objection of Mr. Krishnan Nayar that the Bill is not brought forward by a member of the Jain community.

" Then, Sir, my Friend Mr. Krishnan Nayar stated that if the Government had introduced the Bill he would have thought that it was coming from a responsible quarter. Mr. Krishnan Nayar is incapable of making any insinuations against any person, and I do not think he has intended to convey any insinuation by this statement also, though the literal meaning of what he stated is certainly not complimentary to the hon. Members of this House. I submit, Sir, that any Member of this House has as much responsibility to the country as any Member of the Government. I may even go farther and say that an elected Member of this House is more responsible to the people of this province than all the Members of the Government put together, because the present system of Government is not responsible to the people at all. I therefore submit, Sir, that since a responsible representative of South Kanara, where the community for whom the Bill is intended resides, has brought forward this Bill in this Council, it must not be rejected because it does not come from the Government or from a member of the Jain community.

" One of the objections on the merits of the Bill advanced by my Friend Mr. Krishnan Nayar was this, that it will introduce two systems of law into the same family. I ask Mr. Krishnan Nayar whether two systems do not at present obtain among the Nayars in Travancore and Cochin so far as self-acquired properties of the members of Nayar tarwads are concerned. The introduction of any such system among the Jain community in South Kanara can therefore certainly not be deemed absurd. I therefore submit that that argument of my Friend Mr. Krishnan Nayar has also to be rejected.

" Mr. Krishnan Nayar's next argument is that the widow will be excluded altogether. I do not propose to go into that question, nor do I feel competent to pronounce an opinion on that point. But when the Bill is referred to the Select Committee and considered there, such portions of the Bill as are repugnant to justice may be expunged and such provisions as are beneficial to the community accepted.

20th October 1927] [Mr. K. Madhavan Nayar]

"I hope, Sir, therefore that the House will support Mr. Karant's Bill and reject the arguments advanced by my friend Diwan Bahadur Krishnan Nayar."

* MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur :—"Sir, I rise to support the introduction of the Bill. Mr. Krishnan Nayar said that no member of the Jain community is in this Council and that we do not know what the feeling of the community is, whether it is for or against the Bill. But from what Mr. Karant says it will be seen that the Collector of South Kanara made enquiries and consulted the leading members of the Jain community and found that all of them were unanimous in their opinion that such a Bill is quite necessary. Added to that is the fact that a member of the very community had brought a similar Bill in the last Council, and that goes to show that there can be no objection to the introduction of the Bill as brought by Mr. Karant.

"As regards the objection that there will be two systems in the same family, the Bill is said to be framed on the same principles as the Mappilla Succession Act. There are two systems of inheritance in the Mappilla community also. The self-acquired property of the members of the Mappilla community are governed by the Muhammadan law of inheritance in accordance with this Act whereas the tarwad or family property is governed by the Marumakkattayam law. Therefore, I think, this argument cannot hold good. Mr. Krishnan Nayar also said that the widow or wife and children of the male member will be excluded from inheritance according to the Bill. But, as pointed out by the last speaker, this can be remedied when the Bill goes to the Select Committee. With these observations, Sir, I support Mr. Karant's Bill."

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—"Sir, I regret I cannot concur with the valuable arguments of my hon. Friend Mr. Krishnan Nayar. Of course it is true that this Bill has not been proposed by a member of the Jain community. But unfortunately there is no such member at present in this Council. I cannot agree with Mr. Krishnan Nayar in thinking that unless a Bill of this kind is moved by a member of that community it should not be taken up and considered. As far as this Bill is concerned, it was already moved by a member of that community in the last Council. This community consists of only 9,000 persons and it cannot be hoped that at any time a member of that community would be in this Council. It is not a compliment to the hon. Members of this House to say that they cannot represent any community other than that to which they belong, and I feel that a member of any community would be in a fit position to propose a Bill of this sort.

"Now, Sir, there are certain objections, as the hon. Diwan Bahadur Krishnan Nayar put it, to certain portions of the Bill. One is that there will be two systems of law governing property in the same community. This objection ought to be taken at the Select Committee stage and considered by that Committee, but not now. If the Bill is now rejected and if the community really wants such a change, it will be at a great disadvantage. This Bill has been before the country long enough to make the members of that community aware of the changes that are proposed in it. If really there are any objections to this Bill, we would have received mahazars or the other Members would have been instructed by members of that community to oppose this Bill. We have not come across any such movement by the community itself. That shows that the community welcomes a measure of this kind. If a majority of the members of the community or even an appreciable minority is

[Mr. K. V. R. Swami]

[20th October 1927]

against the Bill, I feel that my hon. Friend, Mr. Karant, would be the last man, representing as he does the constituency of South Kanara, to bring forward this Bill. Therefore, Sir, for all these reasons I support the motion of Mr. Karant and I request you all to support it, so that it might go before the Select Committee where the various views may be represented and considered and the Bill sent to us again."

* Mr. A. B. SHETTY :—" Mr. President, while I am in complete agreement with the objects of the Bill and I sympathise with the desire of the Jains of South Kanara to come into line with their co-religionists in the rest of India, I am not sure that the Bill, as it stands, goes far towards achieving this object. This Bill apparently aims at introducing gradually the system of the Hindu Law of inheritance among the Aliyasantana Jains of South Kanara. Let us examine the Bill with reference to this object. The great majority of Jain family or tarwad properties will continue to be held and enjoyed under the Aliyasantana system even after this Bill comes into operation, because, as the explanation to clause 4 shows the tarwad properties will not be affected by this Bill except in cases in which the family becomes reduced to a single individual and he dies intestate. Such cases must necessarily be few and far between. Self-acquired properties to which this Bill is applicable can and will bear only a very small ratio to the tarwad properties and even among these only the properties that are left undisposed of by will or testament will come under the Bill and these again will form only a small proportion of the self-acquisitions. It can, therefore, be safely said that the Bill does not provide a process by which the Aliyasantana Jains of South Kanara can hope to change the Law of inheritance into Hindu Law within a time however remote.

" As regards the aim of the Bill in bringing the Jains of South Kanara into line with their co-religionists elsewhere, all that the Bill does is to provide heirs out of the patriarchal group of relatives recognized by Hindu Law, but it does not go further and lay down that the property so inherited shall continue to be governed by Hindu Law and in the absence of an express provision the courts of law may construe that such properties shall be governed by Aliyasantana Law. Then also the object of the Bill will have failed. There is another aspect of the Bill which has to be considered, even if an express provision is made in the Bill that property got by virtue of the Bill should be governed by Hindu Law. As already observed by Diwan Bahadur Krishnan Nayar, the Bill is trying to engraft Hindu Law on to Aliyasantana Law and these two systems of law are diametrically opposed to each other. In the case of property got by inheritance there will be no document to show how the property was originally acquired. So confusion may arise after the lapse of some time and both Hindu Law and Aliyasanta Law heirs may set up rival claims and fight, when a person dies leaving property. It will become difficult for strangers to deal with Jains, when they hold properties under two opposed systems of law.

1-16
p.m.

" Another doubt I feel is whether the Bill provided for succession where the person concerned is a female. The expression used in clauses 4 and 5 is 'he.' No doubt, section 13 of the General Clauses Act lays down that words importing the masculine gender shall be taken to include the feminine but that section is said to apply only to Imperial Acts and Regulations. This is perhaps one of the reasons why in the Malabar Marriage Act a separate section, viz., section 24, is devoted to cover cases of succession to property left by a woman. Even supposing that in the Bill the expression 'he' includes 'she' the difficulty is not solved. Under Aliyasantana Law a woman is not under

20th October 1927]

[Mr. A. B. Shetty]

any disability with regard to ownership of property so that a female can inherit and possess separate property with full rights of ownership in the same way as a male. But under the Hindu Law a woman can generally have only a life estate and limited ownership. The question, therefore, arises how the last owner, if a female, is to be regarded under the Bill and who are to be her heirs. Is she to be taken as a Hindu Law female, and is her property to go to the heirs of the last full male owner? Or is she to be regarded as a full owner? This is a problem that will have to be solved.

"The Bill seems intended above all to serve the purpose of preventing properties becoming escheated to Government for lack of Aliyasantana heirs. There have been several unfortunate instances of extensive Jain properties lapsing to Government in South Kanara, even when the deceased persons left wives and children to whom they would have naturally wished the properties to go and the properties would have gone to them under any but the Aliyasantana Law. This Bill will no doubt prevent such escheat. I know that the leading Jains in South Kanara are anxious to have legislation to provide for intestate succession. They may not be very particular that the Hindu Mitakshara Law of Inheritance alone should be made applicable to them. The Hindu Law is very complicated and the Mitakshara System of Inheritance is the least liberal form of it. It gives no place to woman. It makes her a mere object dependent upon man and eligible for nothing more than maintenance, whereas under Aliyasantana Law the position of woman is quite the contrary and she is all in all, having full ownership and every right which males enjoy. I think the Bill may well provide that the wife or husband as the case may be, and the children, sons as well as daughters, should inherit property in equal shares instead of introducing Hindu Law heirs who in some cases are distant and too far removed from near ties of relationship. The Bill may be referred to a Select Committee and the points I have raised may be considered and suitable amendments may be made."

* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—"Mr. President, Sir, it is, I think, right that I should explain in a few words the attitude of the Government towards this Bill. As has been stated, this Bill is a piece of social legislation and affects a small community. At the present time the Government are not prepared actively to support the Bill, but at the same time they have no desire to oppose the introduction of the Bill if it is the wish of the House. If the Bill is introduced, the Government would support the proposal that it should be referred to a Select Committee. The Government would then endeavour to ensure that the provisions of the measure are made known to the persons likely to be affected by them and that the effect of the provisions is fully understood by them. The Government would then ascertain through their local officers whether there is any desire, and if so, to what extent, on the part of the members of this community that this measure as it stands or subject to certain amendments should be passed into law. After the reports are received, the Government would be in a position to determine whether they should support this measure subject, if necessary, to any amendments."

* Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—"Sir, I am really surprised at the attitude taken by the hon. Member from Malabar, Mr. Krishnan Nayar, who, I think, is governed by the same law as that of the Jains but yet is not prepared to change it for a natural system of law. For one thing, this system is really an unnatural one in so far as it divides one's own self-acquired properties among the children of the sister and not one's own children. We want the Jains who are still governed by this system—in fact, they are only a

[Dr. B. S. Mallayya]

[20th October 1927]

minority of the whole community—to replace it by the natural system of inheritance according to which the self-acquired properties of a deceased owner would go to his own children. It is a healthy system and quite a natural one. It is the only system by which you can compel the children of a particular owner to take an interest in the family property. Nobody is going to be disinherited by this Bill. Each one is going to inherit his own father's property, self-acquired, and not that of his maternal uncle. Besides, Sir, I have been watching the whole community for the last forty years. And I have found they are forming a vicious circle around them. In the interests of their property they contract marriages among their nearest relations which produce an unhealthy type of children. The hon. Member, Mr. Krishnan Nayar, said that this Bill was not brought by Government. We have heard the hon. the Law Member who has said that the Government are indifferent and would support any measure provided it is agreeable and desired by the community. I have been there observing the Jains for the last thirty years and I have seen a lot of agitation by these men to get the present system replaced by a natural system of inheritance. There have been a few Jain members here. Mr. Raghuchandra Bellal was unfortunately a stranger to the English language and he had no following while my hon. Friends, Mr. Naganna Hegde and Mr. Manjappa Hegde, though they wanted to have this natural system, had no following, had no push in them and had not the energy sufficient enough to carry on the Bill through the House. In fact the Bill is introduced last session by Mr. Dharmastala Hegde and, though permission was given, unfortunately there was no time to carry it through. Now that an energetic young man from South Kanara, my hon. Friend, Mr. Karant, has taken the trouble at the request of the whole of the Jain community that are governed by this system in South Kanara to carry the Bill through, my hon. Friend, Mr. Krishnan Nayar, thinks of putting a drag on Mr. Karant. I will appeal to him to permit Mr. Karant to push his Bill through; and I will also assure him that a Bill will shortly be brought up to alter the same law also in Malabar. Mr. Krishnan Nayar will have plenty of time to oppose it then. Now it is a case of nearly about 9,000 Jains in South Kanara and I will request my hon. Friend to withdraw his objection and come into a line with us in supporting the measure.”

* Mr. K. R. KARANT:—“Mr. President, Sir, I shall briefly reply to the various points raised by hon. Members. The first point that was raised was that I had no mandate from my constituents for bringing this Bill here. I may assure the hon. Member who made the statement that in a manifesto which I issued before the election, one of the points which I specifically mentioned was that if I were elected to the Council I would push on this Bill. My hon. Friend is quite at liberty to verify the fact. I may also say that in some of the election meetings which I had occasion to address, I did mention the fact and indeed the Government Order from which I made some quotations was given to me by the Jains. It is at their request that I have brought this Bill. And I can assure my hon. Friend from Malabar that this Bill has better sanction from the Jain community whom I represent here than his own Bill from the people of Malabar.

“Next, the objection was raised that there is going to be but a partial change and not a full change. I would very much like it—the younger men in the community would very much like it—if there were to be a complete change. But there is the question of vested interests. There are people who are *ejamans* of the families whose vested interests cannot now be affected. In

20th October 1927]

[Mr. K. R. Karant]

the case of self-acquired properties where the owners die intestate the question of vested interests does not arise and the change in the system of inheritance could easily be effected.

- "The question was raised that women under the Bill had no right. May I state in reply that when the proposal was made, when the Government Order was issued, whether the Jains should have the Indian Succession Act which gave more rights to women or the Hindu Law, the opinion was expressed that the law of succession should be on a line with Hindu Law which governed the rest of the community and they did not want the Indian Succession Act. In the last paragraph of the memorial they submitted, they pray that the Jain community in South Kanara now following the Aliyasantana rules of succession, should be brought within the operation of the ordinary Hindu Law. The opinion of Mr. Vibert, the then Collector of the district, reads thus :

'I have the honour to report that the matter has been fully discussed and there may be said to be a unanimous feeling in the community that the law as to the devolution of self-acquired property of persons dying intestate should be brought into conformity with the Hindu law.'

"That was also the opinion of the Advocate-General. He states :

'While I do not advise legislation on the lines of the Indian Succession Act for the Aliyasantana Jains or the enacting of any special table of inheritance for them, I am of opinion that as regards self-acquired or separate property, their law of succession should be assimilated to the law governing other communities of Jains in this Presidency as well as of other parts of India.'

"The other point that was raised is that under this Bill women will have no rights whereas under the Aliyasantana law, they would have many. But may I point out in reply that it very often happens that the wife and children of a member who dies intestate as the last male member of a family have very little even to live on. Even under the Hindu Law the wife has got a right of maintenance but even such a right is not given at present to the wife of a Jain member. There are several instances where the property escheats to the Government and the wife and children of the last owner are left to live in a miserable condition. And the present Bill confers more rights than those which are now enjoyed by the wife and children of the Jain owner who dies intestate.

"Other doubts have been raised by my hon. Friend from South Kanara. Those are matters which could very well be settled in the Select Committee.

"With these words, I commend the Bill for the acceptance of the House."

The motion that the Bill be read in Council was put and carried.

The Secretary then read the title of the Bill.

The Council then adjourned for lunch.

After Lunch (2-30 p.m.).

Mr. K. R. KARANT :—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move that the Bill now read in the Council may be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following gentlemen :—

1. Mr. S. Satyamurti.
2. Mr. J. A. Saldanha.
3. Dr. B. S. Mallayya.
4. Mr. K. Madhavan Nayar.
5. Rao Bahadur K. Sitarama Reddi.
6. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.

7. Mr. A. B. Shetty.
8. Mr. T. R. Venkatarama Sastriyar.
9. The Law Member.
10. The hon. Dr. P. Subbarayan.
11. Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur.
12. Mr. K. R. Karant."

[20th October 1927]

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

VI

A BILL TO AMEND THE MALABAR WILLS ACT.

MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur :—" I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Malabar Wills Act."

Mr. K. R. KARANT :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried and the leave was granted.

VII

THE VILLAGE OFFICERS BILL.

* Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to introduce the Village Officers Bill * and move that it be read in Council. I need not say Mr. President, that more than three-fourths of the offices of village officers in the Province are hereditary. My Bill seeks to make hereditary those places in the districts where the offices are not hereditary. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons, I say two reasons which make me move this Bill. The first is that it is desirable that there should be uniformity of tenure of office throughout the Province and secondly it is desirable that the unhealthy scramble for office should be avoided. The Government have called for the opinion of the Board of Revenue which is after all the opinion of the various Collectors of the six districts affected by it, and four others in whose districts the appointments are already hereditary. The Board of Revenue in their letter to Government say that the majority opinion is against this Bill and that only one Collector, Mr. Ellis, is in favour of it. I am not quite sure of the analysis of this opinion. For I find that the Collector of the North Arcot district is in favour of it. But apart from this, some of the remarks made by the Collectors themselves seem to be very strong arguments in favour of it. I do not think I need read the whole of it. Anyhow I shall read a few. The Collector of Ramnad says: 'The ideal system is the selection of headmen, etc., on strict principles of heredity, always provided the candidates are properly qualified to do the work.' Of course, in paragraph 4 he says that by strict executive rules he would entirely obviate any unseemly scramble for vacancies. He seems to favour the principle of heredity. Then, Mr. Leach says that one of the Subdivisional Officers, Mr. Ramalingam, says: 'The holders of these offices regard them as stepping stones to other and more valuable appointments and do not display any personal interest and responsibility in their work which would be the case if the offices were placed on a hereditary basis.' Thus, the want of efficient men is falsified by this statement of Mr. Ramalingam who thinks that the more efficient men will try to use this as a stepping stone for other spheres. Mr. Shield who is against heredity says: It is open to the State to transfer property among its subjects at its will. This is one of the statements which he makes in his report. We really do not know if that is correctly grasping the question which he is asked to deal. This remark is rather curious and I do not think it is entitled to any weight. I suppose it is one to vitiate the whole opinion of Mr. Shield. So, two divisional officers are in favour of the principle of heredity

20th October 1927] [Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar]

though not in favour of the Bill. Nine Collectors say they are against the terms. There are those who favour the Bill and there are others who do not favour it. I shall now deal with some of the reasons the Board gives for saying that these appointments ought not to be made hereditary. They will be found in the letter to the Government of Madras. The first is that it would narrow the field of selection and result in loss of efficiency. There is the fact that very efficient people, when taken, go to other places. Then it is said that at the present stage of political development it would be reactionary to confer hereditary rights to offices upon certain persons and their heirs to the prejudice of the rest of the community. I do not know whether these appointments proceed on any political principles and the political policy need not have any bearing on the selection of these officers. The more they are not amenable to political developments the better it is for the administration; for they form the bedrock of administration. Paragraph 4 seems to be curiously contradictory. It is said that the principle of heredity is against good work. The next sentence seems to contradict this sentence. The next sentence is 'The mere fact that a man knows that bad work is likely to result in his family being deprived of the office is a great stimulant to conscientious work.' This is contained in the same report in the same paragraph. I do not exactly know what the Board of Revenue mean by this. Then the Board is against it because the system gives rise to minorships and unhealthy competition for the post of deputy. One of the reasons which I urge for making these posts hereditary is the unhealthy scramble for office. In case where the heir of an hereditary officer is a minor, there is a scramble for deputyship among the few people connected with the family. If this is unhealthy, then the scramble will be more when there will be a number of applicants for the same post. This has been referred to by one of the Collectors as an argument in favour of it. Then the next paragraph, reads: 'The work done in non-hereditary areas is not in any way worse than that done in hereditary tracts. What one would expect the Board to say is that in districts where they are non-hereditary they are more efficient. Then it will be a good argument against its introduction. They have not said that and they presume that these districts where the offices are hereditary are up to the standard which Government requires. In other districts where this will be introduced I do not think they will become worse. In paragraph 8 they speak of the theory of best men. I have already dealt with the theory of best men because it gives rise to frequent vacancies and scramble for offices. Then the Board of Revenue says that public opinion seems to be indifferent over this matter and of course the opinions of the village officers will be in favour of the Bill. I have gathered, from some of the reports published of the various Collectors and the Board of Revenue in various parts of the districts of Salem, the Nilgiris and Madura, public opinion is in favour of this Bill. In other districts it is indifferent, for they have not taken interest in it. In matters like this it is not likely that the public will take more interest. In places where it has been ascertained they seem to be in favour of it. The report does not give any instance where private persons' opinion is very much against it. Especially the opinion of private persons in Palghat and Calicut is in favour of it. So there is no public opinion against it, except in the district of Malabar.

"One great thing which induced me to introduce this Bill is this. As I have already said, the whole revenue administration of the Government depends upon these village officers who form the basis of the administration.

[Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar]

[20th October 1927]

And I say the administration will be the better if there is uniformity and stability in all the districts. While there is stability in twenty districts, why not make it uniform in all the other districts? We will be the better for it and certainly not worse. These are my arguments, Mr. President, for my motion."

* Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—" I second it."

MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur :—" Sir, I am sorry I have to oppose this Bill giving hereditary rights to certain village officers. The very idea is against the principle of democracy. In giving hereditary rights to village officers, we are giving them a position of security, and they feel quite safe. In many places, where the village officers' places are hereditary, the work is very unsatisfactory, and you cannot replace them by competent hands, because the office is hereditary. Only those that are born in a particular family have the right of being appointed to the office. Knowing that, they do not try to improve or qualify themselves as well as they can. So, the work turned out by these uneducated village officers is consequently very unsatisfactory. There are many districts where the office is not hereditary and where good work is done. Therefore, I say that instead of attempting to make the officers hereditary in non-hereditary districts, we must throw them open for nomination by Government of the best available candidate even in districts where the office is now hereditary. With these words, I oppose the motion."

* Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I am rather surprised at the attitude taken up by Mr. Schamnad Sahib, and I would like to advert to it in a moment. The Bill, as the hon. Members of this House will observe, is good so far as it goes. It aims at uniformity. But I cannot understand why the scope of this Bill has been sought to be restricted only to village officers instead of being extended to the village menials also. For, we know as a matter of fact that in certain districts the office of village menial is also hereditary. I should like to be enlightened by the hon. the Mover as to what was at the back of his mind when he restricted the scope of this Bill only to village officers instead of including the village menials as well."

" Now, Mr. Schamnad said that the work done by these men was very unsatisfactory and that in a large number of cases they were uneducated. May I, in all humility, draw his attention to the fact that illiterate men are not entitled to be appointed either under the Act or under the Board's Standing Orders? These village officers, before they are appointed to the office, are required to pass certain tests, and unless they possess some educational qualification as laid down in the Board's Standing Orders, they are not appointed and they shall not be entitled to claim to be appointed as such. The degree of education may vary. But, all the same, a certain standard of education is made compulsory before these people can think of being appointed to the office. Probably, he had in mind one or two stray cases in which illiterate men have been appointed. But, on the whole, so far as we have been able to perceive, apart from varying degrees of education, only men possessing the requisite educational qualification prescribed by the rules are being appointed. Therefore, I venture to submit that his objection on the score of absence of education does not seem to be either substantial or tenable."

" As I began, I end by saying that I am in favour of the Bill, and I hope that attempts will be made in the Select Committee to extend the scope of the Bill to village menials also."

20th October 1927]

* **Mr. A. B. SHETTY** :—“ Mr. President, Sir, as the hon. Mover of the Bill observed, all village officers, the headmen as well as the karnams, are hereditary in most parts of the Presidency, and even in non-hereditary areas like Malabar and South Kanara, the hereditary principle is usually followed in most cases, and members of the family are given preference as far as possible. I do not see why there should be any objection to giving legal sanction to this existing practice and thus bring about uniformity of procedure throughout the province.

“ Now, it is argued that the hereditary system will produce deterioration. I want to know how the system of heredity will necessarily produce deterioration. The village officers have to pass certain examinations and qualify themselves for the post, and if they are not found competent it is open to the Government to dispense with their services at any time. Moreover, is it always the best men that come in by selection, and what is the standard of fitness required? Is it intelligence, or is it position or influence? The village officers, at least the headmen, belong to rich and respectable families; probably they belong to the most influential house in the village. If the office is left open for selection, men with no stake might come in, and they may not command such influence as is necessary to carry on successfully the village administration. If the man selected is one depending on the scanty pay he receives, he cannot be expected to keep up his dignity, and he cannot also be above corruption. If a man of position is in charge of the responsible work of collecting Government revenue, it would be an additional safeguard for money. There will be no fear of misappropriation, as we find in the case of the Co-operative Society funds. If the office is made hereditary, it will make the position of the village officers secure, and it will also mean added prestige to the family. This will afford an inducement to men of position and respectability in the village to accept the manifold duties and responsibilities of this office in return for a comparatively low remuneration. The village officers are keen about this measure of legislation. They have not learnt the art of agitation, and they do not know how to make their voice heard. (Mr. S. Satyamurti: ‘ You do not know them.’) Nor are the people indifferent about this matter. In my district, as the report of the Collector will show, representative men who have been consulted in the matter have definitely expressed themselves in favour of this Bill and the Bunt Advancement Association has passed a resolution in favour of it and public opinion in other districts also is manifestly in favour of this legislation. Only, if this Bill is to become law, it must be suitably amended so as to include provisions legalizing the prevailing right of succession under the Marumakkattayam and the Aliyasanthanam law.”

* **Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR** :—“ I am also strongly in support of this Bill, and I will just say a few words. The village officers, both in their conferences and in their memorials and interviews with the hon. the Revenue Member—and their number is legion, so far as my experience with them goes—have openly and repeatedly declared in favour of this measure, and to my knowledge, if the old records of the Secretariat are ransacked, it will be found that their agitation has been going on at least for the last ten years. In the Salem district, there was a series of conferences in 1918 and 1919, and they all passed resolutions in favour of their being given hereditary right, and they were dealt with by the Government in a half-hearted way. If it is allowable in about twenty districts, I do not know why it cannot be allowed in six other districts; why it should not be given to Salem while all the districts round Salem have got this right. The village officers, Sir, supported by this Council

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [20th October 1927]

also, have been more than once asking for an increase of pay. So far as that goes, their cry has not been heeded. And this hereditary right, the Government can give them without any additional financial burden. As a matter of fact, the Government have recognized the value of this hereditary right of village officers and, while this could be conceded without any cost to their finances, I do not see any reasonable objection at all to recognize this right. Recently, there have been some anomalies also. If there are some rights in ryotwari villages, these rights are not given in zamin villages. If the right exists in one district, it does not exist in the adjacent district. The right exists in Trichinopoly, generally speaking, but it does not exist in Salem. Recently there were some villages, at least in one taluk, which were transferred from one district to another. These were transferred again to the original districts and then retransferred. I have recently come in contact with some unfortunate village officers of a zamin who once belonged to the Trichinopoly district, and, while their village was transferred to the Salem district, the Government openly said that the hereditary right of the village officers will not be disturbed, and after some time, they said that their original order was wrong and that when these people go into the district of Salem they must be bound by the rules governing Salem, and thus their hereditary rights had to be given up. Therefore, Sir, so far as this matter is concerned, there is no reason why we should not have uniformity.

"I will only say a few words as to how the Government itself considers this right to be very valuable. We remember how in the days of non-co-operation the Government thought of bringing these village officers to their side, or on their knees as it were, by enacting emergency measures with the support of the Justice Party, by which village officers who committed any sort of non-co-operation would lose their hereditary rights. Thus, it was thought they would be brought to terms, and I believe the Government was successful to some extent. That shows that Government itself recognize that this hereditary right is of some value. The only objection that will be raised probably is that under hereditary system you cannot get proper men. Can they say that the work of the village officers in the twenty or twenty-one districts where we have the hereditary right is in any way slack? In fact, the Government did not find it necessary at any time to bring in a Bill to remove this hereditary right in those districts. Recently, on the other hand, an Act has been introduced recommending the hereditary right in the case of people who were removed on account of grouping of villages. So that, Sir, from every point of view, there is no reason why the Government should oppose this measure.

3 p.m.

"My hon. Friend from South Kanara said that the mere fact that one is the successor of a village officer should not entitle him to that office irrespective of educational qualifications. That is already the case. Only when one is properly qualified for the post will he be considered to be fit.

"Sir, in the interests of the safety of the Government and in the interests of the kist collection, we want these influential persons in the villages to be the village officers. If the Government want to remove corruption they cannot do better than accept this proposal. If they remove the hereditary nature of the offices, there will be scramble for them and rich men from places outside villages will try to come in with all the attendant evils. Therefore I strongly urge on the Government that they should accept this measure. In any case, I appeal to the House to support this measure unanimously."

20th October 1927]

* Mr. K. KRISHNAN :—“ Sir, I oppose this measure. I have been listening to the various arguments adduced in favour of this proposal and one point on which stress was laid was that there should be uniformity in the administration of these offices. If that principle is to be carried to its logical conclusion I do not see any reason why all the other appointments under the Government should not be hereditary. I do not know why there should be uniformity in the filling up of the village officer post alone and no uniformity in the case of other appointments. I do not know why my hon. Friends have not answered this question.

“ Sir, in this connexion I am reminded of a very curious story that was related to me by a friend who wanted to get an appointment. When he went to an officer and mentioned his qualifications for a vacant post under him, it seems that that gentleman quietly asked him : ‘ Have you any relations in the public service ? ’. My friend then asked him whether that was a qualification and suggested that if that was so he might be given that appointment so that his son might thereafter get it. Such being the case, I suggest that these questions of uniformity should not be taken into serious consideration at all in deciding a question of principle.

“ Sir, the village officer is an important person in a village and so far as his influence in the Legislative Council is concerned I take it that he is the person who makes and unmakes the voters to the Legislative Council. I believe in canvassing for votes he is the person who has got considerable influence in the village.

“ Now, Sir, why should one family be taken as the sole authority to whom every elector of a particular ward has to look up to for support ? It is said that only persons who have the necessary qualifications will be taken from that family for the office. It follows from that that other persons with similar qualifications are to be denied the privilege altogether. There may be persons who are equally qualified and anxious to get such appointments and they will be denied this privilege. I speak particularly of the depressed community and other minorities who have the ambition to get such post in their villages. They will be denied this privilege. I know of many instances in Malabar, where, although this Act does not apply, its principles are made applicable and as far as possible selections are made from among the members of the family of the late village officer. In such cases when the Revenue Divisional Officer who is the officer making such appointments, makes the selection of a best man from that village, the Collector invariably turns round and says, ‘ No, if there are qualified men in the family of the deceased village officer, preference must be given to them ’. Sir, on account of this, very able men in the villages are denied the privilege of enjoying these offices. I do not know whether there is any particular charm in this particular office to make it hereditary. Certain duties are assigned to this office as certain other duties are assigned to the various other offices and, to my mind, there is no difference between this office and the others. I do not see therefore why a particular class of officers should come in for particular patronage and that too for particular villages.

“ Then, Sir, it is said that there would be corruption if this proposal is not accepted. I cannot understand why there should be corruption. Why should one particular family who has got the privilege should alone be singled out as the honest family in the village and the others corrupt ? I am afraid the

[Mr. K. Krishnan]

[20th October 1927]

reverse is the case. In fact, the more we go into the question of democratic institutions the present-day cry is that the villages should be reorganized. If that were to be done, we will be handicapping the persons who have the task of reorganizing the villages, if we appoint now by statutory legislation a hereditary class of village officers who will stand in the way of democratic institutions growing up in the villages in the near future. With these words I oppose the motion."

* The hon. MR. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :— 'Mr. President, Sir, the first question that was asked in connexion with this Bill is why in certain areas these offices are hereditary and why in certain others they are not. The explanation, Sir, is fairly simple and lies in the history and emoluments of these offices. Where the emoluments consisted of lands the offices had to be hereditary because it was very difficult to take possession of these lands from one man and grant them to another. In districts where the emoluments of the village officers were not in the shape of lands, those offices were not hereditary. We therefore have a long continued custom of hereditary officers in certain parts of the country and an equally long custom of non-hereditary officers in certain other parts.

"The hon. Mover referred at some length to the reports that were published and papers placed on the table of this House. He complained of an inconsistency in the report of the Board of Revenue. The explanation is that if an hereditary office holder is dismissed his family would have the right to that office. The office would any way remain in the family. So such a holder has not the same incentive to good work as a non-hereditary official. So there is no inconsistency in the argument in respect of that point.

"As regards the scramble for office I think it will be in the experience of most people who deal with these things that there is a good deal of litigation and scramble for office among the members of a family on the occasion of the death of a hereditary office-holder. In fact one of the greatest disadvantages of the hereditary system is the manner in which the office, during long periods of a minority, goes to a gumasta, to one who is not even a member of the family.

"However, the main reason for which the Government have felt compelled to oppose this Bill is that it seeks to extend a system of privilege which is against the tendency of all modern administrations and they see no reason at the present day when there is no question of emoluments being in the shape of lands why these particular offices should be restricted to particular families and particular castes.

"There is also another consideration to which I would like to refer and that is, the influence of these officials in politics. It is for consideration whether it is advisable that these village officers should be such important factors in politics as to be able to influence legislation in such matters to the extent that they evidently now can."

* MR. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, I have been carefully listening to the speech of the hon. the Revenue Member. He fairly admitted that opinion was somewhat divided in this matter and advanced two arguments against the introduction of the hereditary system. He asked why should we have this privilege extended. I think, in reply to the hon. the Revenue Member, I need only read a few sentences from the report of Mr. Gawne, the Collector of South

20th October 1927] [Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar]

Kanara to the Board of Revenue. I will only read a particular paragraph from it and leave it there as it is a sufficient reply to the hon. the Revenue Member—

‘The introduction of the hereditary system will have the following advantages. It will enable Government to secure a body of village officer who, in spite of the paucity of their pay, will nevertheless discharge their duties satisfactorily on account of prestige attached to their hereditary offices. This applies with special force to potails (headmen) who come from rich and respectable families and whose position in the villages should be such as to command influence and respect among the villagers. If the offices are made purely non-hereditary, these officers will wield, far less influence than they do now. It is also likely that mercenaries appointed under the non-hereditary system may have to depend entirely on their pay, and, this being scanty, they will have either to live below the standard than men of their position are expected to live or to take recourse to illegal means of earning money.’

“Again, Sir, as regards efficiency, he says :

‘Again, in hereditary offices, the father trains the son and the uncle the nephew with the result that, when a nominee enters on his office, he does so with a good deal of practical knowledge of the duties that he has to discharge. Lastly, as pointed out by the Member of the Legislative Council himself, the wild scramble for office will disappear if the offices are made purely hereditary.’

“Sir, as regards the scramble for offices, some hon. Members who opposed this motion stated that there is scramble for every office and therefore why not there be scramble for this office also. Hon. Members seem to forget that the number of offices of village officers is one hundred times larger than the number of other offices in the gift of the Government. For instance, in one taluk there are about 200 village munsifs and karnams, whereas even if all the other offices in that taluk are put together they will not come to more than ten or twenty. Therefore to say that because there will be scramble for twenty offices even if this motion is accepted let there be scramble for 220 offices, is no argument at all. This motion has as its object the reduction of scramble for offices to the minimum possible.

“My hon. Friend, Mr. Krishnan, said ‘why not introduce uniformity and make other offices also hereditary?’ I say that there is absolutely no other office either in this province or anywhere in India which is hereditary. In this province and in some other provinces also only the village officers’ appointments are hereditary. If there is any province where posts of Deputy Tahsildar or Sub-Judge and such like are hereditary, by all means make those posts in this province also hereditary. I submit there is no heredity as regards any other office anywhere in India. If the village officers’ posts are to be made hereditary, it does not mean that every other office ought to be made hereditary. My hon. Friend, Mr. Schammad Sahib, said that if the village officers’ posts are made hereditary, efficiency would deteriorate. Probably the hon. Member has not seen the provisions contained in the Village Officers’ Act. This is what it says in section 10 : ‘No person shall be eligible for the appointment who is not physically and mentally capable of discharging the duties of the office’ and as regards qualification ‘has not qualified according to the educational test prescribed for the office in question by the Board of Revenue by rules made under section 20.’ So much so, if the office is hereditary, if a man is not educationally qualified and efficient, he will not get it, the present incumbent of the post will train his next heir to enable him to fill up the post.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I think the House is ready for the question. The question is that the Village Officers Bill be read in Council.”

The motion was put and declared lost.

[20th October 1927]

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus :

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Rao Bahadur K. Sitarama Reddi. | 24. Mr. Abdul Hamid Khan. |
| 2. Diwan Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. | 25. " C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar. |
| 3. Mr. T. K. Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar. | 26. " G. Harisarvottama Rao. |
| 4. " P. T. Rajan. | 27. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. |
| 5. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 28. " P. Siva Rao. |
| 6. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro. | 29. " P. C. Venkatapati Raju. |
| 7. Mr. C. Venkatarangam Nayudu. | 30. " S. Muttayya Mudaliyar. |
| 8. " K. Madhavan Nayar. | 31. " P. Anjaneyulu. |
| 9. " K. Krishnaswami Nayakar. | 32. " T. Adinarayana Chettiyyar. |
| 10. " K. R. Karant. | 33. " C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 11. " L. K. Tulasiram. | 34. " S. Satyamurti. |
| 12. " K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar. | 35. " Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. |
| 13. Syed Ibrahim Sahib Bahadur. | 36. The Zamindar of Gollapalli. |
| 14. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 37. Mr. J. Kuppuswami. |
| 15. " A. Kaleswara Rao. | 38. " A. B. Shetty. |
| 16. " P. Bakthavatsalu Nayudu. | 39. " H. B. Ari Gowder. |
| 17. " Basheer Ahmad Sayeed. | 40. " C. D. Appavu Chettiyyar. |
| 18. " C. Ramasomayajulu. | 41. " S. V. Vanavudia Goundar. |
| 19. " A. Parasurama Rao. | 42. " A. V. Bhanoji Rao. |
| 20. " C. Obi Reddi. | 43. " T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 21. " K. Uppi Sahib Bahadur. | 44. " Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabapati |
| 22. " D. Narayana Raju. | Mudaliyar. |
| 23. " K. V. R. Swami. | 45. " B. Ramachandra Reddi. |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Mr. N. E. Marjoribanks. | 21. Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur. |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 22. Mr. Muppil Nayar of Kavalappara. |
| 3. " Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell. | 23. " R. Nagan Gowda. |
| 4. " " N. Macmichael. | 24. Subedar Major Nanjappa. |
| 5. " Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. | 25. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. |
| 6. " Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. | 26. " C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar. |
| 7. " Dr. P. Subbaroyan. | 27. " N. Siva Raj. |
| 8. Mr. F. B. Evans. | 28. " M. V. Gangadhara Siva. |
| 9. " J. F. Hall. | 29. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami. |
| 10. " G. T. Boag. | 30. Mr. S. Subrahmanya Mooppanar. |
| 11. " A. C. Tampoe. | 31. " V. Ramjee Rao. |
| 12. " S. H. Slater. | 32. " S. Venkayya. |
| 13. " C. B. Cotterell. | 33. " K. Krishnan. |
| 14. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai. | 34. " V. I. Muniswami Pillai. |
| 15. " R. Foulkes. | 35. " S. N. Dorai Raja. |
| 16. Zamindar of Seithur. | 36. " Abdul Hye Sahib. |
| 17. Mr. Abdul Wahab Sahib. | 37. " S. Arpudaswami Udayar. |
| 18. " J. Bhimayya. | 38. " G. R. Premayya. |
| 19. " J. A. Davis. | 39. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. |
| 20. " V. Ch. John. | 40. Mr. J. Mackenzie Smith. |
| | 41. " C. E. Wood. |

Neutral.

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Diwan Bahadur A. M. M. Murugappa Chettiyyar. | 5. Mr. Tajuddin Sahib. |
| 2. Abdul Kazaak Sahib Bahadur. | 6. Mrs. Muthulakshmi Reddi. |
| 3. The Raja of Panagal. | 7. Mr. Ramanath Goenka. |
| 4. Mr. K. Ramachandra Padayachi. | 8. " Daniel Thomas. |

Ayes 45. Noes 41. Neutral 8.

The motion was carried.

The Secretary then read the title of the Bill.

20th October 1927]

* **Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR** :—"I beg to move, though I have not given notice—I think it is unnecessary to give notice—that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. Under Standing Order 38 (4) a member in charge of the Bill may immediately move that it be referred to a Select Committee. I believe that notice is not necessary and I have not given notice."

* **The hon. the PRESIDENT** :—"The hon. Member considers that it is unnecessary to give notice. It is for me to decide whether it is so."

* **Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR** :—"I beg to move that the Bill be referred to a committee consisting of the following members :—

Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.	Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
" D. Appavu Chettiyyar.	" S. Muttayya Mudaliyar.
" J. A. Saldanha.	" T. Adinarayana Chettiyyar.
" H. B. Ari Gowder.	" Uppi Sahib Bahadur.
Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.	Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan.
Mr. P. C. Venkatapathi Raju.	Mr. P. Anjaneyulu.
The hon. Mr. N. E. Marjoribanks.	" P. Siva Rao."
The Advocate-General.	

* **Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR** :—"I second it."

* **The hon. the PRESIDENT** :—"The hon. Member is requested to pass on the list to me.

"Though according to the Standing Order a motion may be immediately made after the introduction of the Bill, I think hon. Members of the House will realize at least in future that it would be better if they hand over to the President or to the Secretary a list of members of the Select Committee at the time of their making their motion for a select committee and that they should not detain the House unnecessarily."

"The Members of the Select Committee are :—

1. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.	9. Mr. K. Uppi Sahib.
2. " D. Appavu Chettiyyar.	10. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan.
3. " Ari Gowder.	11. The hon. Mr. N. E. Marjoribanks.
4. " J. A. Saldanha.	12. Mr. T. R. Venkatarama Sastriyar.
5. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.	13. " P. Anjaneyulu.
6. Mr. P. C. Venkatapathi Raju.	14. " P. Siva Rao.
7. " T. Adinarayana Chettiyyar.	15. " S. Muttayya Mudaliyar.
8. " R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.	

The motion that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the above members was put and carried.

VIII

A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920.

* **Mr. C. N. MUTHURANGA MUDALIYAR** :—"I beg to introduce the Bill^a to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, and move that it be read in Council.

"Sir, it is a modest measure necessitated by experience of municipal administration for the past few years. The chief items of the amendments relate to, as stated in section 4, the abolition of nominations to the municipal councils and substitution of co-option of not more than four members to the municipal councils for the representation of minorities. Co-option is only suggested as an expedient to get representation of minorities. My chief contention is that

[Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar] [20th October 1927]

nomination must go. In this opinion I have no doubt that I have the support of many hon. Members of this House. The hon. the Chief Minister in a statement on the floor of this House immediately after he assumed office, expressed that nominations should go.

3-30
P.m.

"I have received certain resolutions passed by Adi-Dravida conferences that the system of nominations must go and that some kind of election should be substituted for the representation of their communities. If I may refer to a private conversation, I may say that my hon. Friend, the Raja of Panagal, who has been Minister for Local Self-Government for six years, has also said that the system of nominations must go, and that it is a great evil. So my chief contention, according to this section, is that nominations must be abolished altogether. I am not very particular about the method to be substituted for the representation of minorities. I only suggested co-option as an alternative. I am not committed to it. If a better method is suggested, I am perfectly willing to accept it in the Select Committee.

"Another proposal is to introduce the system of annual election of chairmen. In the original Act of 1920, annual election of chairmen found a place. It is only in the Madras Act of 1922 that the system of annual election of chairmen was done away with and the election of chairmen once in three years substituted. We see that one-third of the members of district municipalities are elected every year so that the character of the council and the personnel are really being changed every year. There is no reason why the same chairman should continue for three years. I would suggest that the chairmen should be elected every year as in the case of city municipalities.

"Another amendment I propose is that there ought to be no paid chairmen. In these days when honorary chairmen are offering themselves to look after the duties, there is no reason why we should have paid chairmen.

"Another amendment—and a very important amendment—that I suggest according to sections 10 and 11 is the removal of the condition of the payment of taxes within a specific time for being a voter. It is not necessary to insist upon the payment of taxes. If a person is assessed to a tax, that fact itself is sufficient to entitle him to a franchise. In these days of manhood suffrage and adult suffrage, I do not think that the payment of taxes should be insisted upon as a condition. Moreover, I feel and it is the experience of many hon. Members in this House that this very condition is used for their own purposes by chairmen of municipalities. Some hon. Members of this House said to me that this was one way of collecting taxes in time. That is not exactly the case. Many presidents in these days are party men and in order to suit their own convenience they really hinder the early collection of the taxes since we have such a provision in the Act now. So, I suggest that this clause must go.

"Another amendment that I propose according to section 9 is to abolish plural constituencies. I propose that the electoral area should be divided into as many areas as there are seats and that the constituencies should also be made more compact.

"Another amendment according to section 12 is for forbidding municipal chairmen from farming out licences of toll-gates for more than one year. This discretion also has been misused to the detriment of the municipal councils themselves. I feel therefore that this power of the municipal councils should be restricted.

20th October 1927] [Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar]

"Lastly, I propose to take away the right of collecting licence fees by the municipalities within a distance of three miles of the municipal limits. This right really belongs to the district boards and taluk boards, and it has been usurped by the Act of 1920. I have the authority of the Kumbakonam Taluk Board and the Saidapet Taluk Board, and they have requested me to introduce this reform in the local boards administration; I feel that the right really belongs to the local boards, and the municipalities should not be allowed to collect these taxes in non-municipal areas.

"These are, in short, the provisions of my Bill. I am committed to the abolition of the system of nomination, to the removal of the condition that the payment of taxes should be made a condition precedent to enfranchisement, and to the amendment regarding the collection of licence fees in the taluk board areas by municipalities. As to the other amendments I am not very particular that they must go in the form in which they stand. If hon. Members would suggest other methods in the Select Committee, I am perfectly willing to accept them. I now move that the Bill be read in Council."

MR. C. S. GOVINDARAJA MUDALIYAR :—"I beg to second the motion."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The question is that the Bill to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act be read in Council."

* KHAN BAHADUR S. K. ABDUL RAZACK SAHIB :—"Mr. President, Sir, I rise to oppose the introduction of this Bill.

"In the first place, a comprehensive amendment of the Madras District Municipalities Act and the Madras Local Boards Act is reported to be under the consideration of Government, and the *Madras Mail* recently wrote that our veteran Registrar-General, Rao Bahadur N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar, was likely to take up the drafting of the amendments. A piecemeal amendment under these circumstances is to be deprecated, especially as there is no urgency about any of the amendments now proposed.

"Again, the main principle underlying the Bill is retrograde in character and out of date. While modern tendencies are all on the line of 'Direct Election' and Government are likely to delete the provision in the Local Boards Act for the election of members to district boards from taluk boards, my hon. Friend urges in all seriousness the system of indirect election in municipal councils. It may be that the present system of nominations has not found favour in some quarters and in some localities, but the remedy suggested is worse than the disease. In the ordered march of progress nomination should be replaced by election—either by the General Electorate or by a Communal Electorate—and not by indirect election.

"The next question is about the term of office of a chairman. Here also my hon. Friend crawls back to the time when provision was made for the nomination or election of a chairman every year. Thanks to the efforts of Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar, we got over the unwholesome provision. Mr. Muthuranga Mudaliyar now proposes to undo all that, and wants the bustle and the sensation connected with the election of a chairman every year. Is this in the interests of the rate-payers or of the councillors who are their representatives?

"Again, when my hon. Friend deals with the question of payment of tax as a preliminary to a vote, he does not realize that he is treading on dangerous grounds. If payment is not insisted on, there would be a demoralising effect.

[Mr. S. K. Abdul Razaack Sahib]

[20th October 1927]

"I might, if I had time, treat all this at more length, but I would be tiring your patience and taking you to details which are probably not necessary at this stage. I trust, I have however said enough to convince you that the provisions in the Bill are retrograde in several respects and that those amendments are also unnecessary at this stage.

"We no doubt credit our hon. Friend with good intentions, but if they are to be given effect to, the several provisions of the Bill will have to be carefully revised by the Select Committee before they can be accepted.

"With these words, I object to the motion."

* Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—"Mr. President, Sir, I also rise to oppose the introduction of this Bill. The amending Bill contemplates four important things. First of all, my hon. Friend, Mr. Muthuranga Mudaliyar, urges that nominations must go and that co-option should be introduced. For many years I may say that the leaders of the depressed classes have been fighting tooth and nail and waiting on deputation on Their Excellencies and Senior Members of the Council to get members of the depressed classes nominated to various bodies. Only for the past about seven years, depressed classes have been enjoying the privilege of nominations to several municipal councils. After the election of the chairman what happens in the councils is that the chairman tries to get a small party of his own to get the administration through. Just before the nomination of depressed class members, the chairman suggests to the district authorities and to the hon. the Ministers as well, the names of such members who will, at all times, support him. Therefore, the right sort of depressed class members are not nominated to the municipal councils. But we have a consolation that we have an appeal to the higher authorities, viz., the District Collectors and the hon. the Ministers. If the system of co-option is to be introduced, I think we will not have even that satisfaction. Therefore I am not in favour of introducing co-option.

"Secondly, my hon. Friend urges that chairmen must be elected to the municipal councils every year. I know what the difficulties are of choosing a chairman every year. If the chairman is to be elected every year it will take him nine months before he is able to know the machinery thoroughly. We have no cadre of experienced chairmen. Hence this will mean putting the carriage before the horse if we are to accept this amendment. Thirdly, my hon. Friend urges that the system of appointing paid chairmen should be abolished. I do not think that this reform would be in the right direction. There are many municipalities which have to deal with large sums of money. Of course it may be possible to get honorary chairmen here and there. But they will not be able to devote their whole time to the administration of municipal matters. The result would be a lot of misuse. Fourthly, my hon. Friend was urging that franchise should be given to all people who are assessed. In the case of some municipal areas where there is a large floating population, it would be difficult.

"In these circumstances, the amendments should not be accepted and I oppose the introduction of the amending Bill in question."

3-45
P.M.

* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI:—"Sir, I willingly support this measure, but I should say that I agree with some of the points put forward by my hon. Friend Mr. Muniswami Pillai. In so far as the measure goes, with regard to the abolition of nominations, I have great sympathy with it, and I think the hon. the Chief Minister will be equally anxious to have these nominations

20th October 1927]

[Mr. K. V. R. Swami]

abolished. I think half of his time is being consumed by these nominations and they give satisfaction to no one. One of the points urged by Mr. Muniswami Pillai is that the depressed classes enjoy at least some measure of satisfaction by being in the Council. For that, in the present Bill a reservation is provided that members of the depressed classes will be co-opted. I would rather move in the Select Committee that these classes may be given the right of election from among themselves. I think that would satisfy the needs of the depressed classes. As wisely pointed out by my hon. Friend Mr. Muniswami Pillai, the nominations have not given satisfaction even to the depressed classes because they have to depend for these nominations on others and have to play to the tune of people who might help them.

"With regard to giving votes to the ratepayers without their paying the taxes, I think that ought to be accepted by us all. Otherwise, as has been pointed out by the hon. Mover, it will really work a hardship. Some men who are not very honest in their methods would direct the tax collector not to collect taxes from particular people and thereby prevent them from getting enrolled as voters. Such complaints are being received now and then. We will have a greater number of voters on the list if this condition is removed.

"With regard to the system of having paid chairmen, I would wish that it is rather extended than abolished. In the interests of the municipalities themselves, I agree that the chairman of every municipality should be an elected man; but in cases where it is thought necessary that there should be paid chairmen, we may have them. We see that the honorary workers are not generally able to pay much attention to their work, and municipal work is very much handicapped. So, in that respect I differ from the hon. Mover.

"With reference to the period, I entirely differ from the hon. Mover. I would wish that it is put at more than three years, at any rate, not less than three years and never at one year. Because, we have to learn the work for six months and canvas votes for the other six months. I have had considerable experience in this matter, having been myself a chairman for six years, and I know the difficulty. As soon as I read the measure limiting the period to one year, I thought the whole municipal administration would come to a standstill. Every councillor thinks that he has got a hold upon the chairman because his election will be coming in a few months. So it may not be easy to get experienced men ordinarily for these offices.

"All these questions may be raised in the Select Committee so that the Bill as it is may be allowed to go to the Select Committee where experienced men will make their own suggestions. I think the Chief Minister will thank us, if we pass it the sooner, because he has got so much worry with regard to these nominations. I hope, therefore, that having consideration for his time and energy, he will kindly see that this motion is passed and the Bill is referred to a Select Committee."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—"Mr. President, Sir, though I do not entirely agree with the Mover of this Bill in many of the provisions, yet I wish that the ball should be set rolling and that the amendment of the District Municipalities Act should be effected very early. No doubt the Chief Minister has been saying since he assumed office, that he is for the abolition of nominations and that he wants to cut down nominations to the lowest possible limit; but nothing yet has been done. Just like the excise policy, the question of the abolition of nominations is going on from day to day without being given effect to. Several

[Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao]

[20th October 1927]

months have elapsed since the present Ministers assumed charge, one year is going to expire, and yet nothing has been done. After all, these things may never take place during the life-time of the present Ministers (laughter)—I mean during the tenure of office of the Ministers. The temptation is always there for the Ministers as also for those who seek nominations at their hands. Nominations demoralize those that give and those that take them, and the earlier we abolish the system of nominations and throw open everything to the will of the people, i.e., to free election, the better will it be for all concerned including those that give those nominations. The reason why I support this Bill at this stage, with all its defects, with all the points in it with which many of us may not agree, is that something should be done at once. Seven years have elapsed since the passing of the present District Municipalities Act in 1920. Six years ran out during the administration of the previous Ministry. They never did anything in the way of reforming this Municipalities Act. This Act was passed by the British Government before the Reforms were introduced. In great haste in the last portion of 1920, just when the Reforms were about to come into force, the Government passed this Act as well as the Local Boards Act. There are many retrograde provisions in these Acts. For instance, vast powers of interference, control and influence are given to the chief representatives of the Reserved side, viz., the Collectors of districts. Political offenders are still kept under ban. The system of nominations and many other provisions which are certainly retrograde provisions ought to have been abolished long, long ago. Every Minister, whether he is of the Justice Party or of the Independent Party or of any party, will be tempted to keep these nominations as long as possible. Therefore, it is the duty of all those who call themselves progressive to abolish this system at once.

“Of course, as has been pointed out by my Mussalman friends and by the Member for the depressed classes, co-option is not a substitute for nominations. Direct election ought to be resorted to, but even co-option is much better than nomination by the Minister. After all, some party which has the support of public opinion in the place will come to power. It is of course not a shameful thing for the Mussalmans, the members of the depressed classes or the Indian Christian community to join those who already command the support of the public of the place, and it may not be difficult for them to get co-option or nomination at the hands of the strongest party in the place. Instead of going all the way to Madras or anywhere else for the purpose of nomination, it is better to go to the very people of the place whom they want to join, for the purpose of nomination. I am opposed to the abolition of plural constituencies; I want that plural constituencies should be there and that the Muhammadan and depressed classes members should have direct election from the people themselves, just like our non-Brahman friends who have communal representation by joint electorate in the Legislative Councils. Therefore, I myself do not approve of co-option.

“With regard to the question of payment of taxes before one becomes eligible for being a voter, I may say that the abolition of that system is the same as extension of franchise. We want as many voters as possible. That is real democracy. By having this restriction that only those who pay their taxes before 31st March are eligible for vote, we are restricting the number of voters. After all, even after 31st March, we have a lot of arrears, and we have to take coercive steps or somehow recover the arrears due. Only by having this restriction, some councillors who happen to be elected for a particular ward fall under the temptation of influencing the bill collectors and preventing them from

20th October 1927]

[Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao]

going and asking those who are likely not to vote for them, to pay taxes. Sometimes it happens that ignorant voters do not know how much they have to pay. In some cases they pay no doubt, but it is difficult to get correct information from the municipal office, and therefore they see, a bit too late, that their names are not included in the voters' list. So, in the interests of extension of franchise and for removing the temptation for mischief referred to by me and for having as large a number of voters as possible, this restriction ought to be taken away.

"I do not agree that the chairman should be elected each year. As pointed out by Mr. Swami, the whole period of one year would be spent in conspiracies, election campaigns, fights and other things. Therefore, what I would have is this: that no man should be elected for more than two terms successively. Afterwards, he may come in again, if he likes."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I am afraid the hon. Member is repeating his own arguments."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO:—"Is there a time-limit to speeches on Bills?"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"There is no time-limit to speeches on Bills but there is a time-limit to the patience of the Members of the House." (Laughter.)

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO:—"Therefore, Sir, although I disagree with the Mover on all these points, I support his motion that it should go to the Select Committee at once. I have myself given notice of a Bill, but it has not been ballotted. The Government in the meanwhile introduce their own Bill in a hurry. All these Bills may be taken up together, and there is no harm if they are taken up now."

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"Mr. President, my hon. Friend, the Mover of this Bill, said that there were six points on which he wanted to amend the District Municipalities Act. I object strongly to two of them. One is co-option of members instead of nomination. As I have said repeatedly in this House, I am against nominations in general. And co-option is worse than even nomination by Government. For, any party with a small majority in a municipal council can entrench itself by nominating its own people and securing a majority, and in that way will make its position unassailable. The other point to which I object is the doing away with the paid chairmen. There are municipalities like Madura and, as my hon. Friend reminds me, Ootacamund, where it will be impossible to get the every-day work of the municipality done unless the chairmen were paid an adequate salary. Until the question of having an executive officer for the municipality is settled, it will be an unwise step to take away the pay of the chairmen. I am glad to find that my hon. Friend, Mr. Swami, is in complete agreement with me in this and would even go further than I am myself prepared to go by saying that we ought to have paid chairmen.

4 p.m.

"The next point to which I raise a strong objection is with reference to the provision that every assessee should go into the voters' list. I think if that is done the position will get worse than what it is to-day. The chief objection that my hon. Friend, Mr. Muthuranga Mudaliyar, raises to the present practice is, that the chairmen manipulate the electoral roll by not receiving the taxes of people who have been assessed. But if we have a rule like the one suggested by him, what will happen is, that the chairmen will assess a large number of people, bring them on the voters' list and fortify their position for purposes of

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

[20th October 1927]

election. That is what is being done even now. And we do not want it. We would rather prefer to have an outside authority preparing the electoral roll and that is a thing which the Government have in mind when they intend to bring forward their amendments to the Act.

"It is on these chief points that I oppose the introduction of the Bill."

* Mr. C. N. MUTHURANGA MUDALIYAR :—“Mr. President, Sir, the two chief points which I emphasized in my speech were the abolition of nomination and the removal of the condition of payment of taxes for being a voter. As for nominations, some hon. Members of this House objected that the method I suggested was an indirect method of election. That method had to be suggested because there is need to provide for the minority communities such as the depressed classes, the Muhammadans and the Indian Christians. As I have already said, I have no objection to substitute any better method that the hon. Minister may suggest. As to the question of payment of taxes as a condition for eligibility, the hon. Minister observed that if my suggestion were adopted, the chairmen would even then manipulate the rolls by increasing the number of assesseses. If that happens, I really welcome it. We want more and more people to be enfranchised; that will also add to the finances of the municipalities. One hon. Member opposed the suggestion for single-member constituencies and recommended plural constituencies. I really sympathize with his reasons. If we consider co-option as an unsuitable device, and if we are to retain reservation of seats for minority communities in a general electorate, certainly I should accept the proposal for plural constituencies as a necessary evil. As I have already said, I am not committed to any of these minor principles except the two which I have originally stated and the necessary amendments may be made at the Select Committee.

“With these words, I move that the Bill be read in Council.”

The motion was put and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Mr. G. R. Premayya. | 16. Mr. C. Obi Reddi. |
| 2. „ Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 17. „ A. Parasurama Rao. |
| 3. „ S. Satyamurti. | 18. „ C. Ramasomayajulu. |
| 4. „ C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. | 19. Bisheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur. |
| 5. „ T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. | 20. Mr. P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu. |
| 6. „ P. Anjaneyulu. | 21. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 7. „ P. C. Venkatapathi Raju. | 22. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 8. „ C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. | 23. „ R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 9. „ G. Harisvottama Rao. | 24. „ Syed Ibrahim Sahib. |
| 10. „ C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar. | 25. „ K. Sivasubramania Ayyar. |
| 11. „ Abdul Hamid Khan. | 26. „ L. K. Tulasiram. |
| 12. „ K. V. R. Swami. | 27. „ K. R. Karant. |
| 13. „ D. Narayana Raju. | 28. „ K. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 14. Dr. B. S. Mallayya. | 29. „ K. Madhavan Nayar. |
| 15. Mr. Uppi Sahib Bahadur. | 30. „ G. Venkatarangam Nayudu. |

Noes.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1. The hon. Mr. N. E. Marjoribanks. | 6. The hon. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 2. „ Khan Bahadur Muhammad | 7. „ Dr. P. Subbarayan. |
| Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 8. Dr. (Mrs.) S. Muthulakshmi Reddi. |
| 3. „ Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell. | 9. Mr. F. B. Evans. |
| 4. „ Mr. N. MacMichael. | 10. „ J. F. Hall. |
| 5. „ Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogya- | 11. „ G. T. Boag. |
| swami Mudaliyar. | 12. „ A. C. Tampoe. |

20th October 1927]

Noes.—cont.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| 13. Mr. S. H. Slater. | 40. Mr. B. Ramachandra Padayachi. |
| 14. „ C. B. Cotterell. | 41. „ K. Abdul Hye Sahib. |
| 15. „ P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai. | 42. „ S. Arpudaswami Udayar. |
| 16. „ R. Foulkes. | 43. The Zamindar of Kallikota. |
| 17. The Zamindar of Seithur. | 44. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. |
| 18. Mr. Abdul Wahab Sahib. | 45. Mr. Saiyid Tajuddin Sahib. |
| 19. „ C. D. Appavu Chettiyar. | 46. „ H. F. P. Hearson. |
| 20. „ H. B. Ari Gowder. | 47. „ A. V. Bhanoji Rao. |
| 21. „ A. B. Shetty. | 48. „ B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 22. „ J. Bheemayya. | 49. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapathi |
| 23. „ J. A. Davis. | Mudaliyar. |
| 24. „ V. Ch. John. | 50. The Raja of Panagal. |
| 25. „ Muppil Nayar of Kavalappara. | 51. Sir A. P. Patro. |
| 26. „ J. Kuppaswami. | 52. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 27. „ R. Nagan Gowda. | 53. Khan Bahadur Saiyid Abdul Razaek Sahib |
| 28. Subadar Major Nanjappa Bahadur. | Bahadur. |
| 29. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. | 54. Mr. P. T. Rajan. |
| 30. „ C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar. | 55. „ T. K. Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar. |
| 31. „ N. Sivaraj. | 56. Diwan Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. |
| 32. „ M. Gangadhara Siva. | 57. „ S. Kumaraswami Reddi- |
| 33. Rao Sahib L. C. Garuswami. | yar. |
| 34. Mr. Subrahmanya Mooppanar. | 58. Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 35. „ Chavadi K. Subrahmanya Pillai. | 59. Diwan Bahadur A. M. M. Murugappa |
| 36. „ Daniel Thomas. | Chettiyar. |
| 37. „ K. Krishnan. | 60. Rao Bahadur K. Sitarama Reddi. |
| 38. „ V. I. Muniswami Pillai. | 61. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram. |
| 39. „ S. N. Dorai Raja. | |

Ayes 30. Noes 61.

The motion was lost.

IX

A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS CITY MUNICIPAL ACT.

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Sir, I move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Madras City Municipal Act.”

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—“ I second it.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ As no hon. Member has objected, leave is granted.”

X

A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The Government have, in regard to this motion, raised the question that the Bill requires the previous sanction of His Excellency the Governor-General under rule 10 (3) of the Legislative Council Rules. Under that rule, if any such question arises, it should be referred to the authority which would have power to grant the sanction if it were necessary. And I therefore propose to refer the question to the decision of His Excellency the Governor-General.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Sir, if you agree that the question has arisen, I agree respectfully with your ruling that it must be referred to the Governor-General. But I request you to kindly give a ruling upon the words ‘ If any question arises ’. If I may put it in an interrogative form, you will pardon me, Sir, does it mean that if anybody raises a question, the Member for Government or any other hon. Member, the question has arisen ? I submit for your consideration that the question must arise on certain prima facie

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[20th October 1927]

reasonable grounds that the Bill is a Bill which requires, on a particular reading of the relevant sections of the Bill and the rules regarding sanction, the sanction of the Governor-General. Otherwise it will come to this. If a Member of this House or of the Government *prima facie* unreasonably says that it is a Bill which requires the sanction of the Governor-General, it may be held that a question has arisen. I should like to know whether the fact of its being raised is quite enough for holding that a question has arisen. I submit that a question there means a question appealing to a reasonable mind in the form of a question having two sides and therefore capable of being argued and decided upon. That is what I would submit for your considered ruling."

4-15
p.m.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"As to the point raised, when once it is brought to the notice of the President that sanction is necessary and when he feels that the question has been raised *bona fide* the further question arises whether the President is to give a tentative ruling and subject his ruling to the revision or otherwise of His Excellency the Governor in the case of a Bill governed by section 80-C of the Government of India Act or of His Excellency the Governor-General in the case of a Bill governed by section 80-A of the Government of India Act. My present view is the constitution does not provide that there should be a sort of appellate jurisdiction over the President. But I think it is desirable in all these cases when *bona fide* questions are raised to leave it to the final decision of the authority provided by the statute or rules. That is why in this case I propose to refer the question for the decision of His Excellency the Governor-General."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—"May I take it therefore that you hold that not only a question has been raised but in your judgment a *bona fide* question has been raised?"

Mr. RAMANATH GOENKA :—"A similar Bill was introduced in the Central Provinces Legislative Council. It was not opposed by the Government and it was moved without the previous sanction of the Governor-General. I want just to put it before you for decision. I have no doubt about rule 19 (3) and I quite agree. But that question must be a *bona fide* one."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I have already said that the question was raised *bona fide*."

XI

THE MALABAR TENANCY BILL.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"I beg to move for leave to introduce the Malabar Tenancy Bill."

Mr. C. GOPALA MENON :—"I beg to second it."

Mr. MUPPIL NAYAR of Kavalappara :—"I oppose it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"When an objection is raised the Member has got the right to mention briefly the provisions of the Bill, and the objector has got also to state his reasons for objection very briefly."

* Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Sir, as you have been pleased to state you can, after a brief explanatory statement from me as well as the opposer, put the question to the House without further debate. In the first place, Sir, I know very well that my Friend, Kavalappara Muppil Nayar, being a janmi, is naturally opposed to the Tenancy Bill. But it was a surprise that he

20th October 1927]

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

has opposed it at this stage. For, during the last six or seven years, a convention has sprung up in this Council not to oppose motions for leave to introduce a Bill. He being a new Member

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Order, order. I do not think the hon. Member will be justified in talking about the practice of allowing the Bills in the first stage of leave to introduce being discussed. Under the Standing Orders he has to make a brief explanatory statement of the objects of the Bill."

* Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Yes, Sir ; my Bill has not yet been published in the Gazette. It has been published in some newspapers and is practically a reproduction of the measure that was passed by an overwhelming majority in the last Council. With some slight variations of minor importance, I introduce practically an identical measure in this Council. I may just bring to the notice of such of the hon. Members as were not Members of the last Council that the Malabar Tenancy Bill was passed in the last Council by 43 votes against 24, and that it did not become law for the reason that His Excellency the Governor was not pleased to give his assent to it. I may also state that I have got the sanction of His Excellency the Governor-General for the introduction of this measure. The Local Government has appointed a committee to go into this question and it was after the appointment of that committee which is now sitting that the Governor-General gave his sanction to this Bill. I know also as a matter of fact that the Governor-General before giving his sanction consulted the Local Government. I have got the sanction of the highest authority for the introduction of this Bill and it is with that sanction I beg leave to introduce a measure which was once passed by this Council. I do not think it necessary to say anything more at this stage."

* Mr. MUPPIL NAYAR OF KAVALAPPARA :—"Mr. President, Sir, I oppose it on the ground that the Government have already appointed a committee to enquire into the question, and as such, by my Friend now introducing a Bill which would necessitate the appointment of a committee, it will be placing the present members of the committee in a very bad position. Because this committee will have to sit in judgment over the other committee."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"I do not want a committee at all."

* Mr. MUPPIL NAYAR OF KAVALAPPARA :—"The select committee in case it is wanted. Apart from that I find that the present Bill is much more drastic than the one that was introduced by him on the previous occasion. Therefore the Council should not give leave to introduce this but wait for the decision of the committee now sitting."

The motion was put and carried.

XII

A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS OUTPORTS LANDING AND SHIPPING FEES ACT, 1885.

Mr. K. R. KARANT :—"I would just move that this may be adjourned to Saturday next as Mr. Saldanha is not doing well."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member Mr. Saldanha is not in his place and the motion is deemed to have been withdrawn."

[20th October 1927]

XIII

A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS VILLAGE COURTS ACT.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" I move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Madras Village Courts Act."

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—" I second it."

The motion was put and adopted.

XIV

MOTIONS ON MATTERS OF GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST.

COMMITTEE TO ENQUIRE INTO THE GRIEVANCES OF NON-GAZETTED OFFICERS.

* Rao Bahadur K. SITARAMA REDDI :—" I have made a speech the other day. If you have no objection I will refer to one or two points more."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have no objection if the House has no objection. I wish to know whether the House is in a mood to allow the hon. Member who moved this resolution a chance to speak again."

(As the House signified its assent the Mover was allowed to continue.)

* Rao Bahadur K. SITARAMA REDDI :—" I thank the House for giving me this concession. It seems to me that it is the lot of this resolution to be always reached late in the day. The other day it was reached at 4-45 and to-day it is 4-20. Since the last sitting of this Council a conference of the Non-gazetted Officers' Association was held at Trichinopoly and it has sent me a copy of the resolutions passed at the conference. My hon. Friend, Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar, my learned friend here, was president of that conference and I am sure he will guide the deliberations here also in redressing the grievances of the non-gazetted officers. One aspect of the question which appeals to me most is, I think, their request that the pension system should be replaced by contributory provident fund system like the one obtaining in the State Railways. This provident fund system obtains in the local boards and I see that the local board servants prefer it to the pension system. If a man retires or dies after putting in some years of service, he may not be entitled to any pension, but the provident fund will provide for his heirs, the widow or children with something to live upon for some time. I do not want to make any further speech upon this. I hope this House will pass this resolution unanimously. It is after all a modest request to appoint a committee of some Members of this House, of some officials of Government, and representatives of the association. The committee may decide one way or the other. A body which is 33,000 strong is certainly a body whose grievances require some investigation. With these few words, I beg leave to move this resolution."

At this stage the hon. the Deputy President took the chair.

4-30
p.m.

a This resolution was under the consideration of the Council at the time of adjournment on 24th August 1927—

"That this Council recommends to the Government that a committee consisting of two officers of Government, two Members of the Legislative Council and two representatives of the non-gazetted services chosen by the Non-gazetted Government Officers' Association, Madras, be appointed to inquire into and report on the grievances and demands of the non-gazetted officers."

20th October 1927]

* Mr. K. R. KARANT :—“ Madam, I beg to move an amendment to the resolution. My amendment stands thus :

‘ For all the words coming after the words “ consisting of ” in line 2, substitute the words “ official and non-official Members of this Council elected by the Council be appointed to enquire into and report on the grievances of the non-gazetted and menial services of the Government and also the possibility of affording relief to them by effecting retrenchment in the number, pay and allowances of the services, gazetted and non-gazetted, the Committee having power to co-opt a member or members of the services concerned for the purposes of the enquiry.” ’

“ And the resolution as amended, if my amendment is passed, would read thus :

‘ This Council recommends to the Government that a committee consisting of official and non-official members of this Council elected by the Council be appointed to enquire into and report on the grievances of the non-gazetted and menial services of the Government and also the possibility of affording relief to them by effecting retrenchment in the number, pay and allowances of the services, gazetted and non-gazetted, the Committee having power to co-opt a member or members of the services concerned for the purposes of the enquiry.’

“ In proposing this amendment, I would say that it has been always said whenever a committee of this sort was asked that there were no funds, and consequently that some sort of retrenchment was absolutely necessary in the higher services. I am not against the resolution as it was moved by the hon. the Mover. Whether my amendment is carried or not, I hope this House will be one in giving some sort of relief to the non-gazetted officers. As I do not wish to speak again, I shall briefly state the reasons for my amendment and say a few words on the resolution put forward by the hon. the Mover. I might state the history of this question, to those at least who are new to this Council, in a few words. The pay of the clerks, who form the chief body of the non-gazetted officers, was first of all fixed in 1859 at Rs. 15 and Rs. 12 on an investigation made under orders of Government by one Mr. Pelly. Then, later on, we find that even the Board of Revenue stated that Rs. 15, the pay which obtained in later years, was hardly enough, and representations were made to the Government. Then, we come to the war years when some allowances were given up to Rs. 6. In 1920 a committee was appointed by the Government called the ‘ Salaries Committee ’ which made a report. Now, very many objections have been taken to this report, and I shall refer to them briefly some time later. The Salaries Committee report, so far as the clerks were concerned, suggested a minimum starting pay of Rs. 30 per mensem in the mufassal and Rs. 35 in the city of Madras. Then, there was also a later report of Mr. Knapp, and then we find in the year 1921 a resolution moved in the Council which was originally made by a non-official Member to which an amendment was made by a Member of Government, the hon. Mr. Todhunter. The resolution as carried by the Council unanimously on the 16th of February 1921 was this :

‘ That this Council recommends to the Government that a committee of this Council be appointed, representative so far as possible of all the interests concerned, to scrutinize the proposals for the revision of salaries of non-gazetted officers which have been submitted to the Government of India and to make recommendations to the Government regarding them and the

[Mr. K. R. Karant]

[20th October 1927]

village officers and regarding the provision of any further funds, the voting of which may be involved by their adoption, the committee to be appointed and to commence its sittings at once and to make recommendations or at least an interim report within such time as may be fixed having regard to the dates appointed for the consideration of the budget.'

"Now, a committee was appointed, the report of which is before me and in a few days after their appointment, by the end of the month of February 1921, they had practically made their report. But I would submit to the House that they themselves called the report an interim report. They said they could not go at length into the various grievances, and they suggested that instead of the minimum starting pay of Rs. 30 and Rs. 35 which was originally proposed by the Salaries Committee, it might be Rs. 35 and Rs. 40 respectively. But I would refer this hon. House to a few observations made by some members of that committee. One of the members, Dr. Gilbert Slater, said :

'When first a clerk enters the services as a lad from school at Rs. 30 per mensem or Rs. 35 per mensem, he is comparatively well off, and can afford to help his parents if he lives at home. It is later, at about the age of 30 and onwards, when he has a family of his own to support, that the pinch comes. I would therefore rather use such financial resources as are available for increased salaries to improve the pay of the middle-aged men, than to increase initial salaries.'

"The hon. Mr. M. D. Devadoss said as follows :—

'The plea of want of funds is no justification for refusing the very reasonable demands of the non-gazetted services. Funds could be found by practising the strictest economy and by retrenchment wherever possible. Without affecting efficiency, several highly paid offices and departments could be abolished and thereby considerable saving could be effected.'

"There are also other opinions, but I do not wish to take the time of this House.

"Then, again, the question came up on the 1st April 1925 on a resolution which was made by the hon. Member Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar, and that resolution also was passed by this House. But the Government did not appoint any committee.

"Now, I shall first state the chief grievances of the non-gazetted officers. There are very many grievances put forward by them. But, so far as I am concerned, I consider that the grievances put forward in respect of those officers who get less than Rs. 80 or Rs. 100 are of a very urgent nature, and I do not feel that there is very much need for helping those who get Rs. 80 or Rs. 100 or more. Then, there are two classes of servants in this category of people below Rs. 80, namely, clerks who get Rs. 35 with an annual increment of Rs. 1-8-0 up to Rs. 50 and then rising by Re. 1 annually to Rs. 60 and the menial servants, the peons and others in offices who get Rs. 12 to Rs. 18. Now, one of the grievances of the non-gazetted officers is that in recommending those salaries the Salaries Committee have not properly gone into the matter. Their first objection is that no examination of witnesses was made except some four or five persons who were questioned as regards rents in Madras. Therefore, their grievance is a legitimate one, viz., that any committee of enquiry should take evidence tendered before them, that family budgets should be examined, and that it is very necessary to hear what the affected people have to say on the matter. A very similar principle was adopted so far as the Public Services Commission and the Lee Commission that were appointed later on were concerned. In those cases, persons in the services concerned were examined, and there is no reason why these non-gazetted officers should be treated in a different way.

20th October 1927]

[Mr. K. R. Karant]

"Then, the next objection is that the Salaries Committee took as the basis Rs. 15 which was paid in the year 1890, which as I said, was fixed in 1859. But the Committee took Rs. 15 as the standard for the decade 1890 to 1900 and then took account of the rise in prices since then till the year 1919 and found that prices rose in the ratio of 100 to 200 and odd. Therefore, they were for doubling the original salary of Rs. 15 in the case of clerks, and in the case of peons from Rs. 6 which was then current to Rs. 12. Now, in these cases, the chief point the non-gazetted officers make out, one which seems to me to be a very reasonable one, is that they should not have started with the assumption that the pay of Rs. 15 and Rs. 6 which were paid in the decade 1890-1900 was sufficient for their needs, whereas it was not actually so. On the other hand, if you are to make a proper calculation, you must take the prices in the year 1859 when that pay of Rs. 15 and Rs. 6 was fixed, and then raise those salaries according to the rise in prices. We find that prices have risen more than three times, from 1859 to 1919. Therefore, their salaries should be multiplied at least by three and not by two.

"Then, a very curious way in which estimates have been made by the Salaries Committee is that estimates for food were taken from the Jail Code and the Famine Code. I would submit that this is rather a very unfair way of estimating what would be necessary to make two ends meet for these persons.

"Now, I would also submit that there can be no two opinions on this matter, that the salary paid to these persons is hardly sufficient to maintain them, and that some sort of help should be given to them. I quite understand, though we have got a release of provincial contributions now, that everything out of that should not go for the salaries. But, all the same, I would submit that the old argument that there were no funds should not stand in the way, and though we may not be able to come up to the expectations of these officers—they put the minimum at Rs. 70 which I myself think is rather too high—there is no doubt that some sort of relief should be given. I have looked into the budgets of the Bombay and Bengal Governments for the year 1926-27, and I find that for similar classes of persons higher salaries are given; at least in the case of peons I find Rs. 20 is the maximum in Bombay whereas we give only Rs. 18, and in Bengal it is Rs. 22. Taking the all-India services and looking at the Postal department and the High Court and some municipalities, one will find that the salary which is given to a clerk or a peon in the service of the Madras Government is not certainly not so much as obtains in those quarters."

* Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I have great pleasure in seconding this amendment. About two years ago, I had the honour and privilege of moving an identical resolution on the floor of this House, and, for the information of new members, I may state that not withstanding the opposition of the then Finance Member, Mr. R. A. Graham, it was carried by this House by a large majority. As the question has been discussed threadbare on the floor of this House, I have no desire to traverse the ground covered by the previous speakers. But I should like, with your permission, Sir, to solicit the attention of this House to what the then Finance Member, Mr. Graham, said. This is what he said :

"I do not want to be unsympathetic, and the Government do not want to lay themselves open to a charge of underpaying their servants. I think, however, that the remuneration offered by the Government compares favourably on the whole with that offered by private persons or

[Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

[20th October 1927]

business men for similar service; and I do not think it would be right for the Government to pay much more than what such service can command. They are willing to accept any reasonable suggestion and will of course be the more ready to improve the position of the non-gazetted services if they feel that it is the unanimous opinion of the Council that that is a proper object on which to spend money, if money is available.'

"That money is now available in some shape or form cannot be gainsaid, and the object of my hon. Friend, the Mover, in bringing this resolution before the Council is to impress upon the Government the strength and the volume of public opinion in favour of a resolution of this character. Therefore, it is our desire that this question should be made a live question so as to make the Government realize the fact that the House is really sincere about it and is anxious that the pay and prospects of the non-gazetted officers ought to be bettered. It is in that light and in that spirit I see this resolution brought forward by my hon. Friend the Mover. We want that this question should be satisfactorily solved. It is not that the Government is asked to commit itself to any definite action. It is not asking the Government to at once throw open its treasury and then disgorge the money by paying large amounts to these low-paid and at the same time overworked non-gazetted officers. All that it seeks is—and the request is very modest—that a committee be constituted to go into the question. Now, all that the then Finance Member said in connexion with this question was that the Government would be willing to accept any reasonable suggestion. The committee will be the proper body before which any reasonable suggestion can be made and it is only for the purpose of enabling us and enabling other persons interested in the betterment of the condition of the non-gazetted officers that we ask the Government to constitute a committee. Because a committee will be the proper forum for the purpose, being clothed with the necessary powers and competent to receive, to consider, and, if necessary, to act upon any reasonable suggestions that may be placed before it. Therefore I have very great pleasure in giving my support to this amendment."

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT:—"Now, the question before the House is that the resolution of Rao Bahadur K. Sitarama Reddiyar be amended as follows:—

'For all the words coming after the words "consisting of" in line 2 substitute the words "official and non-official members of this Council elected by the Council to enquire into and report on the grievances of the non-gazetted and menial services of the Government and also the possibility of affording relief to them by effecting retrenchment in the number, pay and allowances of the services, gazetted and non-gazetted, the committee having power to co-opt a member or members of the services concerned for the purposes of the enquiry."'

* MR. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR:—"Deputy President, Madam, I have very great pleasure in supporting this amendment. I know that the members of the non-gazetted services would have no objection whatever to any method which this committee might resort to for giving them relief. My hon. Friend has said 'by effecting retrenchment.' In fact, it was the great disparity between the scales proposed for the two services that suggested the remedy now repeated by my friend of 'effecting retrenchment'. Again, it was the great disparity in the scales of these gazetted and non-gazetted services that was partly responsible for a great deal of heart-burning. Because in this country social distinctions are based on caste we find that members of the gazetted and non-gazetted services are recruited from the same castes; they

20th October 1927] [Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar]

have the same social obligation, the same social standard to keep up, the same ceremonies to perform, the same expenses to incur in connexion with marriages, etc. Now, when the scales of pay of the gazetted services were increased, it was done very liberally and even more than liberally, whereas the Committee that sat to investigate the question of increasing the salaries of these non-gazetted services, went through their work in a hurry—one of the members of the Committee, Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao himself complained of the haste with which very many points were discussed and considered and of the fact that much information that was indispensable for the proper discussion of the various points raised were not forthcoming and therefore it did not satisfy anybody. So, whether we find funds by effecting retrenchment or by utilization of a portion of the financial relief now granted to us, whatever be the source, it is very necessary to afford the non-gazetted officers the much-needed relief. All that these non-gazetted officers ask for is that their most pressing needs, especially as my hon. Friend Mr. Karant pointed out, the increase in the pay of the lower division clerks and the menials, should be met. The initial pay of the officers and the scale of increments should be liberally revised. There is no doubt that prices have gone up and it is an accepted fact. But what is not very carefully considered is that side by side with the rise in prices many other things have also risen. For instance, the school fees paid by these men for their girls and boys, and the price at which the school books, etc., are selling have increased enormously, also house rents, wages to servants, etc. In very many such ways, the lower division clerks especially are subjected to very great inconvenience, nay, to positive hardship. I find that even the members of the Civil Service are showing their sympathy to the non-gazetted officers. It is really a sign of the times that popular Collectors like Mr. Ellis and Mr. Dutt of Trichinopoly open conferences of these non-gazetted services and advise the members to carry on their agitation constitutionally. The very fact that the agitation of these lower services is constitutional and the constitutional aspect of it has been appreciated and encouraged by popular Collectors shows that their grievances are real and certainly not imaginary.

“Again, I may bring to the notice of the House the fact that the non-gazetted services do a sort of work which is to be appreciated by the House. In one sense I may call these services the steel-frame of the country, because it is on the laborious work that they are doing, dealing with records very carefully, preparing notes by reading several documents, etc., that it is possible for the superior officers to pass orders. They largely base their decisions upon them. Considering the very nature and value of the work done by these officers, it is only fair and equitable that their most real grievances should be gone into without any further delay by the committee proposed by my hon. Friend, the Mover of the resolution, in accordance with the amendment proposed by my hon. Friend from South Kanara. It is not necessary for me to go into further details. I will conclude with drawing the attention of my hon. Friends to the reply made by the hon. Mr. Graham who was the Finance Member at the time, to the Member for the University and others who championed the cause of the non-gazetted services. I am quoting from memory. He said that if each member of the non-gazetted services was to be given an additional salary of Rs. 5, the amount needed would come to Rs. 20 lakhs or so. Well, I think that by effecting retrenchment and by other means it

[Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar] [20th October 1927]

should be possible for us to find the money required for redressing the grievances of these non-gazetted services, especially of the lower division clerks and menial servants."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—"Madam, I beg to support the amendment of my hon. Friend, Mr. Karant. I do not want to repeat the various arguments advanced by my previous speakers in support of the amendment. The grievances of the non-gazetted officers and the menial servants are real. They are low-paid men and the money value of their pay has been decreasing as the prices of food-stuffs, etc., were increasing year after year. Therefore it is absolutely necessary that a committee should go into the whole question very carefully and report to the Government so that they may do whatever possible under the circumstances.

"I support this amendment in preference to the original proposition because, the amendment is more comprehensive in that it deals with the grievances not only of the non-gazetted officers but also of the menial servants of the Government. The original proposition simply refers to the grievances and demands of the non-gazetted officers. It leaves out of consideration the cases of peons, daffadars, process-servers, amins, copyists, attenders, etc., whereas the amendment includes them all. The menial servants are worse off than the higher officers among the non-gazetted services. That is one reason why I support the amendment.

"The other reason why I support the amendment is that it proposes to effect retrenchment if necessary in the number, pay and allowances of the services, gazetted and non-gazetted and gives power to the committee to co-opt members of the services themselves to this committee. Therefore in every way the amendment seems to be better than the original motion, although we all sympathise with the object of it. I suppose there will not be any difference of opinion about it. The committee will report and then we will have to see how best to give effect to its recommendations. Therefore I heartily support the amendment."

* Mr. C. RAMASOMAJULU :—"Madam, I support the amendment of Mr. Karant for the reason that it gives to the committee of enquiry a status much higher than that granted to it by the original resolution. I no doubt perceive one difference in the constitution of the committee as proposed in the original resolution and as proposed in the amendment. In the constitution of the committee as per amendment, representatives of the Non-Gazetted Officers' Association have no place. But I believe that in the practical working out of the matter that omission would not in any way materially affect the merits of the enquiry. Because, naturally the persons who are well-versed in these matters will certainly be asked to give evidence before the committee. Further, it might be that the members of the Association may not, after all, be very willing to serve as members of the committee, particularly because the committee has been empowered to suggest retrenchment in the gazetted services also. In these peculiar circumstances, it might be that the members of the Association may not be willing to serve on the committee conducting an enquiry which would naturally affect the vested rights of their superiors."

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—"Is the hon. Member supporting Mr. Karant's amendment?"

20th October 1927]

• Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU :—“ Yes, Madam. I was saying that the omission of the non-gazetted officers in the amendment does not in any way materially affect the working of the committee. On the other hand it adds to the prestige of the committee, because the committee will be composed of official and non-official members of this Council. There is also power to co-opt a number of members from the non-gazetted services. This co-option will be naturally from the members who are aged in service. Therefore, as the previous speaker has put it, the amendment of Mr. Karant is more comprehensive than the original resolution and I hope that it will be accepted by the House and the grievances of these loyal servants of the Government will be redressed.”

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—“ I hope the House is ready for the question.”

The amendment was put and carried.

The House adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m. the next day.

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,

Secretary to the Legislative Council.

APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to question No. 716 asked by Muhammad Khadir Mohidin Sahib Bahadur at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 20th October 1927, page 258 supra.]

Year.	Sanctioned strength,	Brahmans.		Non-Brahmans.		Mahammatans.		Indian Christians.		Vacant.	
		Number.	Percentage.	Number.	Percentage.	Number.	Percentage.	Number.	Percentage.	Number.	Percentage.
Guntur.											
1925	216	123	57.00	55	25.40	38	17.60	..	..	..	..
1926	218	121	55.50	57	26.40	38	17.40	..	..	2	0.90
1927	226	121	53.60	58	25.60	44	19.50	1	0.44	2	0.88
Nellore.											
1925	126	71	56.00	29	23.00	19	15.00	5	4.00	2	1.60
1926	126	72	57.00	29	23.00	19	15.00	6	5.00	..	..
1927	126	72	57.00	29	23.00	19	15.00	6	5.00	..	..
Ohittoor.											
1925	134	63	47.00	55	41.00	12	9.00	3	2.20	1	0.70
1926	134	63	47.00	54	40.00	12	9.00	4	3.00	1	0.70
1927	134	59	44.00	50	37.00	13	9.70	4	3.00	a8	6.00

a Kept vacant under High Court's orders.

[20th October 1927]

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to question No. 747 asked by Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapathi Mudaliyar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 20th October 1927, page 244 supra.]

Name of the temple committees.	Name of the Member of the Legislative Council appointed as a Member.
1. Chittoor District Temple Committee.	M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur Bollini Muniswami Nayudu Garu, B.A., B.L.
2. Trichinopoly Hindu Devasthanam Committee.	„ Trichinopoly Mooka Pillai Narayanaswami Pillai Avargal.
	„ M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar Avargal.
3. Coimbatore Circle Temple Committee.	„ Rao Bahadur Conjeeveram Sadasiva Ratnasabhapathi Mudaliyar Avargal.
4. Cuddalore Circle Temple Committee.	„ K. Ramachandra Padayachi Avargal.
5. Salem Circle Temple Committee.	„ Cuddalore Dharmalingam Appavu Chettiyar Avargal.

APPENDIX III.

[Vide answer to question No. 748 asked by Mr. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 20th October 1927, page 245 supra.]

Number of applications from each community for admission into the Madras Veterinary College from 1920.

Year.	Brahmans.	Non-Brahmans.	Muham-madans.	Indian Christians.	Anglo-Indians.	Depressed classes	Total.
1920	142	57	29	22	1	..	251
1921	108	57	26	22	..	1	214
1922	162	59	33	17	3	..	274
1923	80	57	17	16	1	..	171
1924	41	35	8	15	..	2	101
1925	51	38	6	12	3	..	110
1926	62	37	13	16	2	..	130
1927	107	97	24	12	..	..	240

Number of stipends awarded in the Madras Veterinary College to students of each community from 1920.

Year.	Brahmans.	Non-Brahmans.	Muham-madans	Indian Christians.	Anglo-Indians.	Depressed classes.	Total.
1920	14	11	6	6	1	..	38
1921	19	11	4	4	..	..	38
1922	11	9	6	2	2	..	30
1923	3	7	3	2	..	..	15
1924	6	5	2	..	..	2	15
1925	4	8	3	..	..	..	15
1926	4	4	2	4	1	..	15
1927	3	7	3	2	..	..	15

Number of students from each community admitted into the Madras Veterinary College from 1920.

Year.	Brahmans.		Non-Brahmans.		Muhammadans.		Indian Christians.		Anglo-Indians.		Depressed classes.		Total.	
	Admitted.	Continued.	Admitted.	Continued.	Admitted.	Continued.	Admitted.	Continued.	Admitted.	Continued.	Admitted.	Continued.	Admitted.	Continued.
1920	14	14	11	11	6	6	6	4	1	1	..	..	38	36
1921	22	19	13	11	6	4	4	4	..	..	..	..	45	38
1922	24	14	14	10	6	6	3	3	3	3	..	..	50	36
1923	16	6	16	8	10	4	3	2	1	..	..	..	46	20
1924	9	6	9	9	2	2	1	1	..	..	2	2	23	20
1925	11	6	12	11	5	3	1	1	..	..	..	..	29	21
1926	16	16	12	9	2	2	6	6	3	..	..	..	38	32
1927	26	20	18	14	7	4	5	4	..	..	..	..	56	42



THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

CORRIGENDA.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF THE
GOVERNOR OF MADRAS.*Thursday, the 20th October 1927.*

Volume XXXVII, No. 3.

- (1) *Page 268.*—In the last line, *delete* the words ‘and move that it be read in Council’.
- (2) *Page 269.*—*Delete* the 3rd line, viz., ‘The Secretary read the title of the Bill’.
- (3) *Page 272.*—*Delete* the last two lines, viz., ‘Mr. C. OBI REDDI: “I move that my Bill be referred to the same Select Committee”’.
- (4) *Page 273.*—*Delete* the first two lines, viz., ‘Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO: “I second it”’.
- ‘The motion was put and carried’.

17th November 1927.

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

Gopala Menon, Mr. C.
Govindaraja Mudaliyar, Mr. C. S.
Guruswami, Rao Sahib L. C.
Hall, O.B.E., I.C.S., Mr. J. F.
Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur, Abdul
Hampayya, Rai Sahib M.
Harisarvottama Rao, Mr. G.
Hearson, Mr. H. F. P.
John, Mr. V. Ch.
Kaleswara Rao, Mr. A.
Karant, Mr. K. R.
Khadir Mohidin Sahib Bahadur, Muhammad.
Koti Reddi, Mr. K.
Krishnan, Mr. K.
Krishnan Nayar, Diwan Bahadur M.
Krishnaswami Nayakar, Mr. K. V.
Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri.
Kumaraswami Reddiyar, Diwan Bahadur S.
Kuppuswami, Mr. J.

Seturatnam Ayyar, Mr. M. K.
Shetty, Mr. A. B.
Sitarama Reddi, Rao Bahadur K.
Siva Raj, Mr. N.
Siva Rao, Mr. P.
Sirasubrahmanya Ayyar, Mr. K. S.
Slater, O.B.E., I.C.S., Mr. S. H.
Smith, Mr. J. Mackenzie.
Srinivasa Ayyangar, Mr. R.
Srinivasa Ayyangar, Mr. T. C.
Srinivasan, Rao Sahib R.
Subrahmanya Moopanam, Mr. S.
Subrahmanya Pillai, Mr. Chavadi K.
Swami, Mr. K. V. K.
Syed Ibrahim Sahib Bahadur, Nattam Dubash
Kadir Sahib.
Tajudin Sahib Bahadur, Syed.
Thomas, Mr. D.
Tulasiram, Mr. L. K.